arXiv:1702.06266v1 [math.CO] 21 Feb 2017

Semilattices of infinite breadth: structure theory and instability of filters

Yemon Choi, Mahya Ghandehari, Hung Le Pham

February 18th, 2017

Abstract

We obtain structure theorems for semilattices of infinite breadth, exploiting their representation as union-closed set systems. In particular we show that every such semilattice admits a subquotient isomorphic to one of three natural examples. This structure theory is then applied to study a stability problem for filters in semilattices, relative to a given weight function: we show that when a union-closed set system has infinite breadth, one may construct a weight function on it such that stability of filters fails. This has applications to questions arising in the theory of Banach algebras.

Keywords: breadth, semilattice, set system, stable characters

MSC 2010: Primary 06A07, 06A12. Secondary 05D10.

1 Introduction

Semilattices appear throughout the mathematical literature in several guises: as commutative semigroups generated by idempotents; as particular examples of partially ordered sets; and as union-closed set systems. The last of these perspectives often allows us to study the internal structure of semilattices using concrete combinatorial methods.

The breadth of a semilattice is a cardinal invariant that provides a measure of its complexity. Breadth is related to more familiar invariants such as width or height, but seems to have received less attention, although there has recently been some renewed interest arising from the set-system perspective ([ADH$^+$16, ADH$^+$13]). Moreover, it appears that previous work has mostly considered the implications of small or finite breadth: see e.g. [Dit84, Gie94, Law71]. To our knowledge, no general structure theory has been developed for semilattices of *infinite* breadth, even though many natural examples of such semilattices are known. (For a potential source of interesting examples, which arise from binary relations that are *stable* in the sense of model theory, see [ADH$^+$16, Proposition 2.20].)

In this paper we study semilattices of infinite breadth by regarding them as union-closed set systems. Our first main result (Theorem 3.10) is a structure theorem, which implies in particular that every infinite-breadth semilattice has a subquotient isomorphic to one of three natural examples. The precise statement is in terms of particular set systems that we can describe very concretely. Our second main result (Theorem 4.5) is a dichotomy theorem, for how a union-closed set system $\mathcal{S}$ interacts with a sequence of larger and larger finite sets. Roughly speaking, the dichotomy says that $\mathcal{S}$ is either sufficiently complex to "shatter" our sequence of sets, or we can pass to a subsequence of sets whose interaction with $\mathcal{S}$ is "tame".

We apply these results to the construction of subadditive $[0, \infty)$-valued functions – which we call *log-weights* – on set systems, and hence on semilattices. The exponential of a log-weight on a semilattice is a weight function in the sense of semigroup theory. Given such a weight ω on a semilattice, we introduce and study the property of having *ω-stable filters*, which can be thought of as a kind of Hyers–Ulam stability property. In previous work of the first author [Cho13], it was shown – formulated in different language – that every semilattice of finite breadth has ω-stable filters for all weights ω. As an application of our structure theorem and dichotomy theorem, we establish the converse result: given any semilattice S of infinite breadth, there exists some weight $\omega : S \to [1, \infty)$ such that S does not have ω-stable filters. (See Theorem 5.6 and Corollary 5.7.) The proof is somewhat delicate, and takes up all of Section 6.

In Section 7, we sketch how these results provide new examples of commutative semisimple Banach algebras that do not have stable characters (sometimes known as the AMNM property, see [Joh86]). This application of our structure theory suggests that semilattices of infinite breadth could be useful for constructing "exotic" Banach algebras. We note that certain Banach algebras associated to semilattices with *finite breadth* have been studied in [LLM77]. Finally, we discuss some particular set systems and log-weights, which show that ω-stability of filters does not have good hereditary properties in general; this illustrates why some natural attempts to give easier proofs of Theorem 5.6 do not work.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Semilattices and log-weights

A *semilattice* is a commutative semigroup S satisfying $x^2 = x$ for all $x \in S$. Such an S has a standard and canonical partial order: if $x, y \in S$ we write $x \preceq y$ whenever $xy = x$. It is easily checked that this does define a partial order on S, and so we may talk of familiar notions from order theory such as height and width.

With respect to this particular partial order, xy is the *meet* (or *greatest lower bound*) of x and y. Hence semilattices admit an alternative definition: they are partially ordered sets where every pair of elements has a meet. One could work with the opposite partial order (in which case we would replace meets by joins), but the convention above is motivated by the following example.

Example 2.1. Consider $\{0, 1\}$ equipped with usual multiplication. This is a semilattice, and we have $0 \preceq 1$. More generally, in a semilattice S with a unit element $\mathbf{1}$ (satisfying $\mathbf{1}x = x$ for all $x \in S$) and a zero element θ (satisfying $\theta x = \theta$ for all $x \in S$) we have $\theta \preceq x \preceq \mathbf{1}$ for all $x \in S$.

However, in later sections it is sometimes useful to read $x \preceq y$ as: "x is a multiple of y" or "y is a factor of x". In this language, xy is the "largest common multiple" of x and y.

Definition 2.2 (Weights and log-weights). Let S be a semilattice. A *weight* on S is a function $\omega : S \to [1, \infty)$ which is submutiplicative, i.e. satisfies

$$\omega(xy) \leq \omega(x)\omega(y) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in S.$$

A function $\lambda : S \to [0, \infty)$ which is subadditive, i.e. satisfies $\lambda(xy) \leq \lambda(x) + \lambda(y)$ for all $x, y \in S$, is called a *log-weight*.

Definition 2.3 (Compressible/incompressible subsets). Let S be a semilattice. Given a finite, non-empty subset $E \subseteq S$, we say E is *compressible* if there exists a proper subset $E' \subset E$ such that $\prod_{x \in E} x = \prod_{x \in E'} x$; otherwise, we say E is *incompressible*.

Our terminology is not entirely standard; the same property is referred to in [LLM77, Mis86] as "meet irredundant". However, "incompressible" seems a better word when we come to work with union-closed set systems (see also Remark 2.9).

To aid intuition, we observe that for any finite subset $E \subseteq S$, the subsemigroup of S generated by E has cardinality $\leq 2^{|E|} - 1$; equality occurs if and only if E is incompressible. The proof is straightforward, see also Exercise 6(c) of [Bir67, Section II.5].

Definition 2.4 (Breadth). The *breadth* of S is defined to be

$$\sup\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \text{ every subset } E \subseteq S \text{ with } n+1 \text{ elements is compressible}\}$$

and we denote it by $b(S)$.

Remark 2.5. By definition, $b(S) = \infty$ implies there are arbitrarily large finite subsets of S that are incompressible. However, in general we cannot arrange for these to be nested in an infinite sequence $E_1 \subseteq E_2 \subseteq \ldots$ We will see this very clearly with the three examples of semilattices introduced in Section 3.

The breadth of a semilattice sheds some light on its structure, and is related to more familiar order-theoretic concepts such as height and width. (Some basic links, with references, are surveyed in [ADH+13, Section 4.1].) For instance, by examining incompressible subsets, one sees that if $b(S) \geq n$ then S contains a chain (totally ordered subset) and an antichain (subset in which no two elements are comparable) both of cardinality n. In particular, a semilattice S has breadth 1 exactly when the poset $(S, \preceq)$ is totally ordered.

However, semilattices become complicated very quickly as their breadth grows, and diverse behaviour occurs even among semilattices of breadth 2. To illustrate this, we observe that every infinite k-ary rooted tree, when $k \geq 2$, is a semilattice with breadth 2 which contains infinite chains and infinite antichains.

Example 2.6 (Infinite k-ary rooted tree). Let $k \geq 2$. An infinite k-ary rooted tree is an infinite rooted tree in which every vertex has k children. If x and y are vertices in the tree then they have a "youngest" common ancestor, which we denote by $x \wedge y$. Clearly $\wedge$ is a commutative, associative and idempotent binary operation; so the set of vertices becomes a semilattice $(T, \wedge)$, and the partial order $\preceq$ becomes "is an ancestor of".

There is an infinite path $P \subset T$ obtained by starting at the root and successively taking the 1st child; this gives us an infinite chain in $(T, \preceq)$. If we take the elements of P and take the $2nd$ child of each element, this gives us an infinite antichain in $(T, \preceq)$.

On the other hand, let $x, y, z \in T$, and let $p = x \wedge y \wedge z$. Then either $x \wedge y$ or $y \wedge z$ is equal to p: for if not, then the set $\{p, x \wedge y, y \wedge z, y\}$ would form a cycle of length ≥ 3 in the tree T, which is impossible. Thus every 3-element subset of S is compressible, and so $b(S) \leq 2$. On the other hand, $b(S) \geq 2$, since S is not totally ordered.

2.2 Concrete semilattices

Let Ω be a non-empty set. Let $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ denote the full power set, $\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{fin}}(\Omega)$ the set of all finite subsets, and $\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{fin}}_*(\Omega)$ the set of all non-empty, finite subsets of Ω. Clearly the power set $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$, when equipped with set-union as binary operation, is a semilattice; it may be identified with the abstract semilattice $\{0,1\}^\Omega$ in which multiplication is defined co-ordinatewise.

Definition 2.7. A *union-closed set system* on Ω is a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ which is closed under taking finite unions.

Union-closed set systems, with union as binary operation, are typical examples of semilattices; sometimes we will call them *concrete semilattices*. In particular, both $\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{fin}}(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{fin}}_*(\Omega)$ are concrete semilattices. Conversely, every semilattice is isomorphic to a concrete semilattice. Indeed, let S be a semilattice. For $x \in S$ let

$$E_x := S \setminus \{y \in S : \ y \preceq x\}.$$

It is easily checked that $E_x \cup E_y = E_{xy}$ for all $x, y \in S$. Therefore, the function $E_\bullet : S \to \mathcal{P}(S)$, $x \mapsto E_x$, defines an injective homomorphism from S into the concrete semilattice $(\mathcal{P}(S), \cup)$. This is sometimes known as the *Cayley embedding* of a semilattice, in analogy with what happens in group theory.

If a semilattice S admits some embedding in some $\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{fin}}(\Omega)$ (not necessarily the Cayley embedding), then we can obtain weights and log-weights on S by restricting ones defined on $\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{fin}}(\Omega)$.

Example 2.8. Let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{fin}}(\Omega)$ be union-closed, and let $a \in (1, \infty)$. The function $\mathsf{x} \mapsto |\mathsf{x}|$ is a log-weight on $(\mathcal{S}, \cup)$, and the function $\mathsf{x} \mapsto a^{|\mathsf{x}|}$ is a weight on $(\mathcal{S}, \cup)$.

Remark 2.9. Union-closed set systems may be more familiar to combinatorists than abstract semilattices. One should beware that if $\mathcal{S}$ is a union-closed set system, then its canonical partial order as a semilattice is not given by inclusion but by containment:

$$\mathsf{a} \preceq \mathsf{b} \iff \mathsf{a} \supseteq \mathsf{b}$$

So for $\mathsf{a}, \mathsf{b} \in \mathcal{S}$, the $\preceq$-meet of a and b is not $\mathsf{a} \cap \mathsf{b}$, but rather $\mathsf{a} \cup \mathsf{b}$; really, we are working with "join-semilattices" inside $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$. This is one reason for our terminology "incompressible" instead of "meet-irredundant".

Notational conventions. Elements of Ω will be denoted by lower-case Greek letters. Set systems on Ω (i.e. subsets of $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$) will be denoted by letters such as $\mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{S}$, etc. If $\mathcal{B}$ is such a set system, we refer to *members of* $\mathcal{B}$ rather than elements. If $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ are set systems on Ω we denote their union and intersection by $\mathcal{B} \vee \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{B} \wedge \mathcal{S}$. Members of a set system $\mathcal{S}$ will be denoted by letters such as a, b, p, etc., and we write $\mathsf{a} \cup \mathsf{b}$ and $\mathsf{a} \cap \mathsf{b}$ for their union and intersection respectively.

To avoid cluttered formulas, we introduce the following notation.

Definition 2.10 (The join of a set system). Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$. Define $\mathrm{join}(\mathcal{F}) := \bigcup_{\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{F}} \mathsf{x}$.

Breadth in the concrete setting. The notions of compressibility and incompressibility for union-closed set systems can be formulated more intuitively through the following simple observations.

REMARK 2.11. Consider the finite set system $\{\mathsf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{x}_m\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$. The following statements are equivalent:

(i) there exists j such that $\mathsf{x}_j \cap \bigcap_{i \neq j} \mathsf{x}_i{}^c = \emptyset$;

(ii) there exists j such that $\mathsf{x}_j \subseteq \bigcup_{i \neq j} \mathsf{x}_i$;

(iii) $\{\mathsf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{x}_m\}$ is compressible.

By the remark above, a finite subset $\{\mathsf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{x}_m\}$ of $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ is incompressible if and only if for every j, there exists an element $\gamma_j \in \Omega$ such that

$$\gamma_j \in \mathsf{x}_j \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_j \notin \operatorname{join}(\{\mathsf{x}_i : \ i \neq j\}). \tag{1}$$

DEFINITION 2.12 (Witnesses of incompressibility). Let $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathsf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{x}_m\}$ be a finite subset of $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$. A subset $E = \{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_m\}$ of Ω is called a *witness of incompressibility* for $\mathcal{F}$ if it satisfies (1).

3 Three key examples, and a structure theorem

If $N \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is an infinite subset, and $(t_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is a sequence in $\mathbb{R}$, we say that $t_n \to \infty$ *along* $n \in N$ if for all $K > 0$ the set $\{n \in N \colon |t_n| \leq K\}$ is finite. This is equivalent to saying that the subsequence $(t_{n_k})_{k \geq 1}$ converges to infinity where $N = \{n_k : \ k \in \mathbb{N}\}$.

DEFINITION 3.1. A *spread* is a sequence $\mathcal{E} = (E_n)_{n \geq 1}$ of finite non-empty subsets of Ω which are pairwise disjoint and satisfy $|E_n| \to \infty$. Note that a spread $\mathcal{E} = (E_n)_{n \geq 1}$ does not need to cover Ω. A *refinement of* $\mathcal{E}$ is a spread $\mathcal{F} = (F_j)_{j \geq 1}$ with the property that each F_j is contained in some $E_{n(j)}$ and $n(j) \neq n(k)$ whenever $j \neq k$.

Given a spread $\mathcal{E} = (E_n)_{n \geq 1}$, we define three special semilattices inside $\mathcal{P}(\operatorname{join}(\mathcal{E}))$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $E_{<n} := E_1 \,\dot\cup\, \cdots \,\dot\cup\, E_{n-1}$ (with the convention that $E_{<1} = \emptyset$) and let $E_{>n} := \bigcup_{j \geq n+1} E_j$. We then define

$$\mathcal{T}_{\max}(\mathcal{E}) := \bigvee_{n \geq 1} \bigvee_{\emptyset \neq \mathsf{a} \subseteq E_n} \{E_{<n} \,\dot\cup\, \mathsf{a}\}\,,$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{\min}(\mathcal{E}) := \bigvee_{n \geq 1} \bigvee_{\emptyset \neq \mathsf{a} \subseteq E_n} \{\mathsf{a} \,\dot\cup\, E_{>n}\}\,,$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{ort}}(\mathcal{E}) := \bigvee_{n \geq 1} \bigvee_{\emptyset \neq \mathsf{a} \subseteq E_n} \{E_{<n} \,\dot\cup\, \mathsf{a} \,\dot\cup\, E_{>n}\}\,.$$

Recall that the use of $\dot\cup$ is to signify that the union is a disjoint one.

Each of these set systems has a natural partition into "levels" indexed by $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Each level is itself union-closed, and is semilattice-isomorphic to $\mathcal{P}_*(E_n)$; in particular, in each level there is an incompressible subset with cardinality $|E_n|$. (See Figure 1.)



Figure 1: Typical members of $\mathcal{T}_{\max}$, $\mathcal{T}_{\min}$, and $\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{ort}}$ at level n

Hence the semilattices $\mathcal{T}_{\max}(\mathcal{E})$, $\mathcal{T}_{\min}(\mathcal{E})$, and $\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{ort}}(\mathcal{E})$ have infinite breadth. They also share the following fundamental feature: if $\mathcal{F}$ is an incompressible subset in any of these semilattices, with $|\mathcal{F}| \geq 3$, then all members of $\mathcal{F}$ must belong to the same "level". We thus have extremely precise control over the incompressible subsets in these examples.

These set systems are, we feel, both natural and tractable. For instance, they are (isomorphic to) standard examples, in the lattice-theoretic literature, of semilattices that have infinite breadth yet have "locally finite breadth". In particular they do not contain any copies of $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \cong \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$. (See [Mis86] for further discussion of locally finite breadth and its relation to non-embeddability of $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$.)

The main result of this section, Theorem 3.10, tells us that the set systems $\mathcal{T}_{\max}$, $\mathcal{T}_{\min}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{ort}}$ are not just natural and tractable; they are in some sense *unavoidable*. To make this precise requires more notation and terminology, which we now give.

Definition 3.2 (Notation). Given $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$, $\mathsf{a}, \Gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}^{-\Gamma} &:= \{\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{S} \colon\ \mathsf{x} \cap \Gamma = \emptyset\}, \\ \mathcal{S}_{\Gamma} &:= \{\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{S} \colon\ \mathsf{x} \supseteq \Gamma\}, \\ \mathcal{S} \boxminus \mathsf{a} &:= \{\mathsf{x} \setminus \mathsf{a} :\ \mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{S}\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\Omega), \\ \mathcal{S} \boxtimes \mathsf{a} &:= \{\mathsf{x} \cap \mathsf{a} :\ \mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{S}\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, each of these is union-closed if $\mathcal{S}$ is.

One can use these operations to illustrate the very different behaviour of the semilattices $\mathcal{T}_{\max}(\mathcal{E})$, $\mathcal{T}_{\min}(\mathcal{E})$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{ort}}(\mathcal{E})$. For example, it is easy to see that $\mathcal{T}_{\max}(\mathcal{E})^{-\Gamma}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{ort}}(\mathcal{E})^{-\Gamma}$ are finite semilattices, for any $\emptyset \neq \Gamma \subseteq \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{E})$. However, for every finite subset Γ of Ω, $b(\mathcal{T}_{\min}^{-\Gamma}) = \infty$. On the other hand, $\mathcal{T}_{\min} \boxminus \mathsf{a}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{ort}} \boxminus \mathsf{a}$ are finite but $b(\mathcal{T}_{\max} \boxminus \mathsf{a}) = \infty$, whenever a belongs to the corresponding semilattice.

Definition 3.3. Let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ be union-closed, and let $\mathsf{a} \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$. We say $\mathcal{S}$ is *thick in* a if the semilattice $\mathcal{S} \boxtimes \mathsf{a}$ has infinite breadth, and *thin in* a if $\mathcal{S} \boxtimes \mathsf{a}$ has finite breadth.

Lemma 3.4. *Let* $\mathsf{a}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{a}_n \subseteq \Omega$, *and set* $\mathsf{a} := \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \mathsf{a}_i$. *If* $\mathcal{S}$ *is thin in all the* a_i, *then it is thin in* a.

Proof. Let $m_i = b(\mathcal{S} \boxtimes \mathsf{a}_i)$ and let $N = \sum_{i=1}^n m_i$. We will show $b(\mathcal{S} \boxtimes \mathsf{a}) \leq N$. Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ with $|\mathcal{F}| > N$. Since $\mathcal{S} \boxtimes \mathsf{a}_i$ has breadth m_i, there exists $\mathcal{F}_i \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with $|\mathcal{F}_i| \leq m_i$ and $\bigcup_{\mathsf{x}\in\mathcal{F}_i} \mathsf{x} \cap \mathsf{a}_i = \bigcup_{\mathsf{x}\in\mathcal{F}} \mathsf{x} \cap \mathsf{a}_i$. Let $\mathcal{F}' = \bigvee_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}_i$: then $|\mathcal{F}'| \leq N$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{join}(\mathcal{F} \boxtimes \mathsf{a}) &= \bigcup_{\mathsf{x}\in\mathcal{F}} \mathsf{x} \cap (\cup_{i=1}^n \mathsf{a}_i) = \bigcup_{\mathsf{x}\in\mathcal{F}} \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathsf{x} \cap \mathsf{a}_i = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \left(\bigcup_{\mathsf{x}\in\mathcal{F}} \mathsf{x} \cap \mathsf{a}_i \right) = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \left(\bigcup_{\mathsf{x}\in\mathcal{F}_i} \mathsf{x} \cap \mathsf{a}_i \right) \\ &\subseteq \bigcup_{\mathsf{x}\in\mathcal{F}'} \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathsf{x} \cap \mathsf{a}_i = \operatorname{join}(\mathcal{F}' \boxtimes \mathsf{a}) \subseteq \operatorname{join}(\mathcal{F} \boxtimes \mathsf{a}),\end{aligned}$$

which shows that $\operatorname{join}(\mathcal{F} \boxtimes \mathsf{a}) = \operatorname{join}(\mathcal{F}' \boxtimes \mathsf{a})$. □

Since finite semilattices have finite breadth, the case $n = 2$ of Lemma 3.4 yields:

COROLLARY 3.5. *Let $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ be a semilattice with infinite breadth. If p is a* finite *subset of Ω then S is thick in p^c.*

We now introduce two auxiliary conditions which are in close relation with the set systems $\mathcal{T}_{\max}, \mathcal{T}_{\min}$, and $\mathcal{T}_{\text{ort}}$ defined earlier.

DEFINITION 3.6 (Auxiliary conditions).

(A) for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $\mathsf{p} \in \mathcal{S} \cup \{\emptyset\}$ such that $\mathcal{S}$ is thick in p^c, there exists an incompressible size k-subset $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{S} \boxminus \mathsf{p}$ such that $\mathcal{S} \boxminus \mathsf{p}$ is thick in $\operatorname{join}(\mathcal{F})^c$.

(B) for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and every pair of subsets c, Γ of Ω such that $\mathcal{S}^{-\Gamma}$ is thick in c, there exists an incompressible size k-subset $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{S}^{-\Gamma} \boxtimes \mathsf{c}$ with a witness of incompressibility E such that $\mathcal{S}^{-\Gamma\cup E}$ is thick in c.

Note that Condition (A) implies that $(\mathcal{S} \boxminus \mathsf{p}) \boxminus \operatorname{join}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{S} \boxminus (\mathsf{p} \cup \operatorname{join}(\mathcal{F}))$ has infinite breadth, and $\mathsf{p} \cup \operatorname{join}(\mathcal{F}) = \bigcup_{\mathsf{x}\in\mathcal{F}} (\mathsf{p} \cup \mathsf{x})$ is again a member of $\mathcal{S}$.

REMARK 3.7. In what follows, we show that conditions (A) and (B) may be used to induce at least one set system of the form $\mathcal{T}_{\max}, \mathcal{T}_{\min}$, or $\mathcal{T}_{\text{ort}}$ from any semilattice with infinite breadth. This is motivated by the simple observation that amongst the three set systems, $\mathcal{T}_{\max}$ is the only one that satisfies Condition (A), and $\mathcal{T}_{\min}$ is the only one that satisfies Condition (B). In other words, conditions (A) and (B) formulate the distinctive features of $\mathcal{T}_{\max}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\min}$ respectively (and $\mathcal{T}_{\text{ort}}$ does not satisfy either condition).

LEMMA 3.8. *Suppose that $\mathcal{S}$ has infinite breadth and satisfies (A). Then there exists a spread $\mathcal{E} = (E_n)_{n\geq 1}$ such that $\mathcal{S} \boxtimes \operatorname{join}(\mathcal{E})$ contains the set system $\mathcal{T}_{\max}(\mathcal{E})$.*

Proof. First we shall construct by induction sequences $(\mathsf{d}_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ and $(\mathcal{F}'_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\Omega))$ with the following properties:

(i) $\mathcal{S}_n := \mathcal{S} \boxminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{n-1} \mathsf{d}_j$ has infinite breadth for each n;

(ii) $\mathcal{F}'_n$ is an incompressible finite subset of $\mathcal{S}_n$ of size n, and $\operatorname{join}(\mathcal{F}'_n) = \mathsf{d}_n$.

(iii) $\bigcup_{j=1}^{n-1} d_j \in \mathcal{S} \cup \{\emptyset\}$.

Indeed, suppose $\mathcal{S}_n$ has been found which has infinite breadth and is of the form $\mathcal{S} \boxminus \mathsf{p}_n$ for some $\mathsf{p}_n = \bigcup_{j=1}^{n-1} \mathsf{d}_j \in \mathcal{S} \cup \{\emptyset\}$. (When $n = 1$, $\mathcal{S}_1 = \mathcal{S}$ has infinite breadth by assumption.) By Condition (A), there exists an incompressible size-n subset $\mathcal{F}'_n \subset \mathcal{S}_n$, such that $\mathcal{S}_n$ is thick in $\mathrm{join}(\mathcal{F}'_n)^c$

Set

$$\mathsf{d}_n := \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{F}'_n) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{S}_{n+1} := \mathcal{S}_n \boxminus \mathsf{d}_n = \mathcal{S} \boxminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{n} \mathsf{d}_j \,.$$

Since $\mathsf{p}_n \in \mathcal{S} \cup \{\emptyset\}$, we have $\mathsf{x} \cup \mathsf{p}_n \in \mathcal{S}$ for every $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{S}_n$. Let $\mathsf{p}_{n+1} := \bigcup_{j=1}^{n} \mathsf{d}_j$; then $\mathsf{p}_{n+1} = \mathsf{p}_n \cup \mathsf{d}_n \in \mathcal{S}$. Thus the inductive construction can be continued. By induction, the sets d_n ($n \in \mathbb{N}$) are disjoint.

Now, for each n, choose a witness E_n of the incompressibility of $\mathcal{F}'_n$. Then $E_n \subseteq \mathsf{d}_n$. Also, set

$$\mathcal{F}_n := \{\mathsf{x} \cup \mathsf{p}_n = \mathsf{x} \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{n-1} \mathsf{d}_j \colon \ \mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{F}'_n\} \,.$$

Take $\mathcal{E} := (E_n)_{n \geq 1}$. Then $\mathcal{E}$ is a spread in Ω and $(\bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}_n) \boxtimes E$ generates the set system $\mathcal{T}_{\max}(\mathcal{E})$. Since $\mathcal{F}_n \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, this completes the proof of the lemma. □

LEMMA 3.9. *Suppose that $\mathcal{S}$ has infinite breadth and satisfies (B). Suppose also that for every spread $\mathcal{E}$ in Ω, the semilattice $\mathcal{S} \boxtimes \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{E})$ does not contain the set system $\mathcal{T}_{\max}(\mathcal{E})$. Then there exists a spread $\mathcal{E}$ in Ω such that $\mathcal{S} \boxtimes \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{E})$ contains the set system $\mathcal{T}_{\min}(\mathcal{E})$.*

Proof. Our hypothesis, together with Lemma 3.8 and the fact that $\mathcal{S}^{-\Gamma} \boxtimes \mathsf{c}$ is a subsemilattice of $\mathcal{S} \boxtimes \mathsf{c}$, leads to the following:

($*$) if $\mathsf{c}, \Gamma \subseteq \Omega$ such that $b(\mathcal{S}^{-\Gamma} \boxtimes \mathsf{c}) = \infty$ then $\mathcal{S}^{-\Gamma} \boxtimes \mathsf{c}$ doesn't satisfy Condition (A).

We use this observation as part of an inductive argument. Suppose that $(E_j)_{j=1}^{n-1}$ and $(\mathsf{c}_j)_{j=1}^{n-1}$ have been constructed such that, when we take

$$G_{n-1} = \bigcup_{j=1}^{n-1} E_j \quad \text{and} \quad \mathsf{d}_{n-1} = \bigcap_{j=1}^{n-1} \mathsf{c}_j \,,$$

then $\mathcal{S}^{-G_{n-1}}$ is thick in d_{n-1}. Put $\mathcal{S}_n := \mathcal{S}^{-G_{n-1}} \boxtimes \mathsf{d}_{n-1}$, which has infinite breadth by the inductive hypothesis. (When $n = 1$ the usual conventions give $\mathcal{S}_1 = \mathcal{S}$, which has infinite breadth by assumption.) By observation ($*$), $\mathcal{S}_n$ cannot satisfy Condition (A), so there exist $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathsf{p}_n \subseteq \mathsf{d}_{n-1} \setminus G_{n-1}$ such that

- $\mathcal{S}_n$ is thick in p_n^c,
- for every incompressible size-k-subset $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{S}_n \boxminus \mathsf{p}_n$,

$$(\mathcal{S}_n \boxminus \mathsf{p}_n) \boxminus \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{F}) \quad \text{has finite breadth.} \tag{2}$$

Since

$$\mathcal{S}_n \boxminus \mathsf{p}_n = \mathcal{S}^{-G_{n-1}} \boxtimes (\mathsf{d}_{n-1} \setminus \mathsf{p}_n) \,, \tag{3}$$

by Condition (B), there exists an incompressible subset $\mathcal{F}'_n$ of $\mathcal{S}_n \boxminus \mathsf{p}_n$ of size kn with a witness of incompressibility E' such that:

$$\mathcal{S}^{-G_{n-1}\cup E'} \quad \text{is thick in} \quad \mathsf{d}_{n-1} \setminus \mathsf{p}_n\,. \tag{4}$$

Partition $\mathcal{F}'_n$ into n parts each of size k, and let $\mathcal{F}''_n$ be the collection of the n unions of the parts. Then $\mathcal{F}''_n$ is an incompressible subset of $\mathcal{S}_n \boxminus \mathsf{p}_n$ of size n, and we can also choose a witness E_n of incompressibility for $\mathcal{F}''_n$ such that $E_n \subseteq E'$.

Set $G_n = G_{n-1} \cup E_n$. From (4), $\mathcal{S}^{-G_n}$ is thick in $\mathsf{d}_{n-1} \setminus \mathsf{p}_n$; whereas from (2), for each $\mathsf{x}'' \in \mathcal{F}''_n$, the semilattice $(\mathcal{S}_n \boxminus \mathsf{p}_n) \boxminus \mathsf{x}''$, and hence its subsemilattice

$$\big(\mathcal{S}^{-G_{n-1}\cup E_n} \boxbslash (\mathsf{d}_{n-1} \setminus \mathsf{p}_n)\big) \boxminus \mathsf{x}'',$$

have finite breadth. Therefore, by Lemma 3.4, $\mathcal{S}^{-G_n}$ is thick in

$$(\mathsf{d}_{n-1} \setminus \mathsf{p}_n) \cap \bigcap_{\mathsf{x}''\in\mathcal{F}''_n} \mathsf{x}'' = \mathsf{d}_{n-1} \cap \bigcap_{\mathsf{x}''\in\mathcal{F}''_n} \mathsf{x}''.$$

Thus setting $\mathsf{c}_n := \bigcap_{\mathsf{x}''\in\mathcal{F}''_n} \mathsf{x}''$ will allow us to continue the induction.

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, by (3), we form a subset $\mathcal{F}_n \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ of size n by choosing for each $\mathsf{x}'' \in \mathcal{F}''_n$ some $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$ with

$$\mathsf{x} \cap G_{n-1} = \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \mathsf{x}'' = \mathsf{x} \cap \mathsf{d}_{n-1} \setminus \mathsf{p}_n\,. \tag{5}$$

By construction, $E_n \subseteq \mathsf{d}_{n-1} = \bigcap_{j=1}^{n-1} \mathsf{c}_j$. So for each $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{F}_n$, $\mathsf{x} \supseteq \mathsf{c}_n \supseteq E_j$ $(j > n)$. Moreover, since E_n is a witness of incompressibility for $\mathcal{F}''_n$, we see that, for every $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{F}_n$, the set $\mathsf{x} \cap E_n$ is a singleton. Finally, from (5) we see that for $j < n$

$$E_n \cap E_j \subseteq \operatorname{join}(\mathcal{F}_n) \cap G_j \subseteq \operatorname{join}(\mathcal{F}_n) \cap G_{n-1} = \emptyset\,.$$

So if we set $\mathcal{E} := (E_n)_{n\geq 1}$, which is a spread in Ω, then $\mathcal{S} \boxbslash \operatorname{join}(\mathcal{E})$ contains the subsemilattice generated by $(\bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}_n) \boxbslash \operatorname{join}(\mathcal{E})$, which is the set system $\mathcal{T}_{\min}(\mathcal{E})$. □

We now state and prove our structure theorem for infinite breadth semilattices.

THEOREM 3.10. *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be an infinite breadth subsemilattice of $(\mathcal{P}(\Omega), \cup)$. Then at least one of the following statements holds.*

(i) *there is a spread $\mathcal{E}_1$ in Ω such that $\mathcal{S} \boxbslash \operatorname{join}(\mathcal{E}_1) \supseteq \mathcal{T}_{\max}(\mathcal{E}_1)$.*

(ii) *there is a spread $\mathcal{E}_2$ in Ω such that $\mathcal{S} \boxbslash \operatorname{join}(\mathcal{E}_2) \supseteq \mathcal{T}_{\min}(\mathcal{E}_2)$.*

(iii) *there is a spread $\mathcal{E}_3$ in Ω such that $\mathcal{S} \boxbslash \operatorname{join}(\mathcal{E}_3) \supseteq \mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{ort}}(\mathcal{E}_3)$.*

Proof. Assume that Case (i) does not hold. Then, by Lemma 3.8, $\mathcal{S}$ cannot satisfy Condition (A). Hence, there exist $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathsf{p} \in \mathcal{S} \cup \{\emptyset\}$, such that $\mathcal{S}$ is thick in p^c, yet for every incompressible size-k-subset $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{S} \boxminus \mathsf{p}$, $\mathcal{S} \boxminus \mathsf{p}$ is thin in $\operatorname{join}(\mathcal{F})^c$.

Replacing $\mathcal{S}$ by $\mathcal{S} \boxminus \mathsf{p}$ if necessary, we suppose from now on that $\mathcal{S}$ has infinite breadth, and satisfies

(C1) $\mathcal{S}$ is thin in $\operatorname{join}(\mathcal{F})^c$, for every incompressible size-k-subset $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{S}$.

Note that replacing $\mathcal{S}$ by $\mathcal{S} \boxminus \mathsf{p}$ does not change the property that Case (i) fails to hold. So if $\mathcal{S}$ satisfies Condition (B), we are in case (ii) by Lemma 3.9.

From here on, we assume $\mathcal{S}$ does not satisfy Condition (A) and does not satisfy Condition (B). By the previous observations, there exist $\mathsf{d}, \Gamma \subseteq \Omega$ such that $\mathcal{S}^{-\Gamma}$ is thick in d, and, by enlarging k if necessary, such that for every incompressible size-k-subset $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{S}^{-\Gamma} \boxtimes \mathsf{d}$ and every witness of incompressibility E for $\mathcal{F}$, the semilattice $\mathcal{S}^{-\Gamma \cup E}$ is thin in d.

Note that in such a situation $E \subseteq \mathsf{d}$, hence

$$\mathcal{S}^{-\Gamma \cup E} \boxtimes \mathsf{d} = \left(\mathcal{S}^{-\Gamma} \boxtimes \mathsf{d}\right)^{-E}.$$

Thus, replacing $\mathcal{S}$ by $\mathcal{S}^{-\Gamma} \boxtimes \mathsf{d}$ if necessary, we shall suppose from now on that $\mathcal{S}$ satisfies the following condition:

(C2) for every incompressible subset $\mathcal{F}$ of size k of $\mathcal{S}$ and every witness of incompressibility E for $\mathcal{F}$, the semilattice $\mathcal{S}^{-E}$ has finite breadth.

Clearly, if $\{\mathsf{y}_1 \cap \mathsf{d}, \ldots, \mathsf{y}_n \cap \mathsf{d}\}$, for $\mathsf{y}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{y}_n \in \mathcal{S}^{-\Gamma}$, is incompressible in $\mathcal{S}^{-\Gamma} \boxtimes \mathsf{d}$ then $\{\mathsf{y}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{y}_n\}$ is incompressible in $\mathcal{S}$. Also, for any $\mathsf{y} \in \mathcal{S}^{-\Gamma}$

$$\left[\mathcal{S}^{-\Gamma} \boxtimes \mathsf{d}\right] \boxminus (\mathsf{y} \cap \mathsf{d}) = \left[\mathcal{S}^{-\Gamma} \boxminus \mathsf{y}\right] \boxtimes \mathsf{d} = [\mathcal{S} \boxminus \mathsf{y}]^{-\Gamma} \boxtimes \mathsf{d}.$$

Therefore, after replacing $\mathcal{S}$ by $\mathcal{S}^{-\Gamma} \boxtimes \mathsf{d}$, we can assume that $\mathcal{S}$ satisfies both Condition (C1) and Condition (C2). Consequently, using a similar argument, we show that $\mathcal{S}_D \boxtimes \mathsf{q}$ satisfies conditions (C1) and (C2), for every $D, \mathsf{q} \subseteq \Omega$. Indeed, let $\mathcal{F}$ be an incompressible subset of $\mathcal{S}_D \boxtimes \mathsf{q}$ of size k, and E be a witness of incompressibility for $\mathcal{F}$. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a k-element subset of $\mathcal{S}_D$ such that $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G} \boxtimes \mathsf{q}$. Then $\mathcal{G}$ is an incompressible subset of $\mathcal{S}_D$, since E is a witness of incompressibility for $\mathcal{G}$ as well. Thus,

$$(\mathcal{S}_D \boxtimes \mathsf{q}) \boxminus \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{F}) = (\mathcal{S}_D \boxminus \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{G})) \boxtimes \mathsf{q} \subseteq (\mathcal{S} \boxminus \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{G})) \boxtimes \mathsf{q}$$

has finite breadth as $\mathcal{S}$ satisfies Condition (C1). Moreover, since certainly $E \subseteq \mathsf{q}$, we have

$$(\mathcal{S}_D \boxtimes \mathsf{q})^{-E} = (\mathcal{S}_D)^{-E} \boxtimes \mathsf{q} \subseteq \mathcal{S}^{-E} \boxtimes \mathsf{q},$$

which has finite breadth, as $\mathcal{S}$ satisfies (C2).

Suppose that we already have $\mathcal{S}_n = (\mathcal{S}_D) \boxtimes \mathsf{q}$ that has infinite breadth where

$$D = \bigcup_{j=1}^{n-1} E_j \quad \text{and} \quad \mathsf{q} = \bigcap_{j=1}^{n-1} \mathsf{c}_j \quad \text{are subsets of } \Omega\,.$$

(When $n = 1$, the usual convention gives $\mathcal{S}_1 = \mathcal{S}$ which has infinite breadth by assumption.) Take an incompressible subset of $\mathcal{S}_n$ of size $k(n+k)$, partition that subset into $n+k$ parts each of size k, and let $\mathcal{G}'_n$ be the collection of the $n+k$ unions of the parts. Then $\mathcal{G}'_n$ is an incompressible subset of $\mathcal{S}_n$ of size $n+k$. Moreover, each $\mathcal{S}_n \boxminus \mathsf{x}$ has finite breadth for each $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{G}'_n$, since $\mathcal{S}_n$ satisfies (C1).

Choose a witness E'_n of incompressibility for $\mathcal{G}'_n$. From Condition (C2) for $\mathcal{S}_n$, we observe that $\mathcal{S}_n^{-E}$ has finite breadth for every k-element subset E of E'_n. Since

$$\mathcal{S}_n = \bigcup_{E \subseteq E'_n,\ |E|=k} \mathcal{S}_n^{-E} \ \cup \bigcup_{E \subseteq E'_n,\ |E|=n} (\mathcal{S}_n)_E,$$

there exists a subset E_n of E'_n of size n such that $(\mathcal{S}_n)_{E_n}$ has infinite breadth. Let $\mathcal{G}''_n$ be the subset of $\mathcal{G}'_n$ corresponding to E_n, and then let $\mathcal{G}_n$ be a subset of $\mathcal{S}$ formed by choosing for each $\mathsf{x}'' \in \mathcal{G}''_n$ an element $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{S}_D$ such that $\mathsf{x}'' = \mathsf{x} \cap \mathsf{q}$.

Set $\mathsf{c}_n := \bigcap_{\mathsf{x}\in\mathcal{G}_n} \mathsf{x}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{n+1} := (\mathcal{S}_n)_{E_n} \boxtimes \mathsf{c}_n$. Then $\mathcal{S}_{n+1}$ has infinite breadth by Lemma 3.4; noting that $(\mathcal{S}_n)_{E_n}$ has infinite breadth while

$$(\mathcal{S}_n)_{E_n} \boxminus \mathsf{x} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_n \boxminus \mathsf{x} = \mathcal{S}_n \boxminus \mathsf{x}''$$

have finite breadth for every $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{G}_n$, where $\mathsf{x}'' = \mathsf{x} \cap \mathsf{q} \in \mathcal{G}''_n \subseteq \mathcal{G}'_n$. Also,

$$\mathcal{S}_{n+1} = (\mathcal{S}_{D\cup E_n}) \boxtimes (\mathsf{q} \cap \mathsf{c}_n)$$

and so the induction can be continued.

Note that:

(i) each $\mathcal{G}_n$ is an incompressible subset of $\mathcal{S}$ with witness E_n of size n,

(ii) $\mathsf{x} \supseteq \bigcup_{j\neq n} E_j$ for every $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{G}_n$, and

(iii) $E_j \cap E_n = \emptyset$ whenever $j < n$.

To see (ii), note that $\mathcal{G}_n \subseteq \mathcal{S}_D$, so $\bigcup_{j=1}^{n-1} E_j \subseteq \mathsf{x}$ for every $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{G}_n$. On the other hand, by the inductive definition of c_n we have

$$E_n \subseteq \mathsf{q} = \bigcap_{j=1}^{n-1} \mathsf{c}_j \subseteq \bigcap_{j=1}^{n-1} \bigcap_{\mathsf{x}\in\mathcal{G}_j} \mathsf{x},$$

which proves $E_n \subseteq \mathsf{x}$ whenever $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{G}_m$ with $m < n$. To see (iii), note that E_n is a witness of incompressibility for the subset $\mathcal{G}_n$ of $\mathcal{S}_D$, and so $E_n \cap D = \emptyset$ when $n > 1$. Thus if we set $\mathcal{E} = (E_n)_{n\geq 1}$, this is a spread in Ω; and $\mathcal{S} \boxtimes \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{E})$ contains the subsemilattice generated by $(\bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{G}_n) \boxtimes \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{E})$, which is the set system $\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{ort}}(\mathcal{E})$. This completes the proof. □

4 A dichotomy theorem

When dealing with semilattices of infinite breadth, it is natural to inquire about the nature of their incompressible subsets. In particular, one may ask whether a semilattice $\mathcal{S}$ of infinite breadth contains a nested chain of incompressible sets of growing sizes. It is easy to see that the answer to this question is negative for any semilattice of the form $\mathcal{T}_{\max}, \mathcal{T}_{\min}$ or $\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{ort}}$ over a spread $\mathcal{E}$. In this section, we study the structure of semilattices which possibly fail this condition.

We first investigate what occurs when we do have such a nested chain.

LEMMA 4.1. *Let $m, k \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose $\mathsf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{x}_{m+k}$ are distinct non-empty subsets of Ω, such that $\{\mathsf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{x}_{m+k}\}$ is incompressible. Let $\mathsf{d} = \mathsf{x}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathsf{x}_m$. Then $\{\mathsf{x}_{m+1} \setminus \mathsf{d}, \ldots, \mathsf{x}_{m+k} \setminus \mathsf{d}\}$ is an incompressible subset of $\mathcal{P}(\Omega) \boxminus \mathsf{d}$.*

Proof. Consider a witness of incompressibility for $\{\mathsf{x}_i \colon 1 \leq i \leq m+k\}$, with $\alpha_i \in \mathsf{x}_i$. It is easily checked that the elements of the witness corresponding to x_{m+j} $(1 \leq j \leq k)$ form a witness of incompressibility for $\{\mathsf{x}_{m+j} \setminus \mathsf{d} \colon 1 \leq j \leq k\}$. □

PROPOSITION 4.2. *Let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ be a concrete semilattice. Suppose there is a sequence $(\mathsf{a}_n)_{n\geq 1}$ of distinct members of $\mathcal{S}$ with the following property: for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, the set $\{\mathsf{a}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{a}_m\}$ is incompressible. Then there is a spread $\mathcal{E}$ in Ω such that $\mathcal{S} \boxtimes \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{E})$ contains $\mathcal{T}_{\max}(\mathcal{E})$.*

This can be seen to follow immediately from Lemma 3.8: the subsemilattice of $\mathcal{S}$ generated by $\{\mathsf{a}_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ satisfies the auxiliary condition (A) from the previous section, even in a rather strong sense (cf. Lemma 4.1). However, in this special case, it can also be argued directly as follows.

Proof. Fix positive integers $n_1 < n_2 < \ldots$ such that $n_{k+1} - n_k \to \infty$ (for instance we could take $n_k = k^2$). Let $\mathsf{d}_k = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n_k} \mathsf{a}_i \in \mathcal{S}$, and for convenience set $\mathsf{d}_0 = \emptyset$, $n_0 = 0$.

By Lemma 4.1, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the set $\mathcal{F}'_k := \{\mathsf{a}_j \setminus \mathsf{d}_{k-1} : n_{k-1} + 1 \leq j \leq n_k\}$ is an incompressible subset of $\mathcal{S} \boxminus \mathsf{d}_{k-1}$. Let E_k be a witness of incompressibility for $\mathcal{F}'_k$. Since $E_k \subseteq \mathsf{d}_{k+1} \setminus \mathsf{d}_k$ and $|E_k| = n_{k+1} - n_k$, the sequence $\mathcal{E} = (E_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a spread in Ω.

To finish, it suffices to show that given $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and some $\omega \in E_k$, there exists some $\mathsf{z} \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\mathsf{z} \cap \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{E}) = E_{<k} \dot\cup \{\omega\}$. Since E_k is a witness of incompressibility for $\mathcal{F}'_k$, there exists $\mathsf{z}' \in \mathcal{F}'_k$ such that $\mathsf{z}' \cap E_k = \{\omega\}$. Our construction also ensures that $E_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_{k-1} = \mathsf{d}_{k-1} \cap \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{E})$. Put $\mathsf{z} = \mathsf{z}' \cup \mathsf{d}_{k-1}$: this satisfies $\mathsf{z} \cap \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{E}) = E_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_{k-1} \cup \{\omega\}$, and we must show $\mathsf{z} \in \mathcal{S}$. But since z' has the form $\mathsf{a}_i \setminus \mathsf{d}_{k-1}$ for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\mathsf{z} = \mathsf{a}_i \cup \mathsf{d}_{k-1} \in \mathcal{S}$, as required. □

The following definition describes a much stronger property than having a nested sequence of incompressible sets.

DEFINITION 4.3 (Shattering a spread). Let $\mathcal{E} = (E_n)_{n\geq 1}$ be a spread in Ω and let $(\mathsf{a}_j)_{j\geq 1}$ be a sequence of subsets of Ω. We say that this sequence *shatters* $\mathcal{E}$ if, for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and every m-tuple $(\mathsf{y}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{y}_m)$ such that $\mathsf{y}_j \in \{\mathsf{a}_j, {\mathsf{a}_j}^c\}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, m$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left| E_n \cap \bigcap_{j=1}^m \mathsf{y}_j \right| = +\infty.$$

Recall from Remark 2.11 that the condition

$$\mathsf{y}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathsf{y}_m \neq \emptyset \quad \text{whenever } \mathsf{y}_j \in \{\mathsf{a}_j, {\mathsf{a}_j}^c\} \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq m$$

implies that $\mathsf{a}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{a}_m$ are mutually distinct and form an incompressible subset of $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$. Our definition, roughly speaking, is meant to capture the following situation: if we start with the sequence (a_j) and allow ourselves to take complements and binary unions (i.e. we generate a ring of sets) then the resulting collection has high complexity; moreover, this complexity is seen inside each E_n once we take n sufficiently large. (In fact, if $(\mathsf{a}_j)_{j\geq 1}$ shatters some spread, then in particular this sequence freely generates a Boolean subalgebra of $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$: see e.g. [GH09], Chapter 28, Lemma 1.)

DEFINITION 4.4 (Decisive colourings). Given a spread $\mathcal{E}$, a partition of Ω into finitely many subsets $\Omega = C_1 \dot\cup \cdots \dot\cup C_d$ is said to *colour* $\mathcal{E}$ if $\lim_n |C_j \cap E_n| = \infty$ for each j. We call $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, \ldots, C_d\}$ a *colouring of* $\mathcal{E}$.

If we are also given a set system $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$, we say that the colouring $\mathcal{C}$ *decides* $\mathcal{S}$ *with respect to* $\mathcal{E}$ if there exists a colour class $C_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ with the following property: every $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$ satisfies

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \min\{|\mathsf{x} \cap C_0 \cap E_n| \, ; \, |\mathsf{x}^c \cap C \cap E_n| \, , C \in \mathcal{C}\} < \infty \, . \tag{6}$$

In this context we say C_0 is a *decisive colour class.* A colouring that has no decisive colour class is said to be *indecisive* (for $\mathcal{S}$ with respect to $\mathcal{E}$).

Informally speaking, when we have a decisive colour class C_0, we know that a set $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$ must either have small intersection with $C_0 \cap E_n$, or else have large intersection with $C \cap E_n$ for some $C \in \mathcal{C}$, once n is sufficiently large.

To see a simple example, let $\mathcal{E} = (E_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a spread in Ω. Let C_1, C_2 be such that $\Omega = C_1 \dot{\cup} C_2$ and $||C_1 \cap E_n| - |C_2 \cap E_n|| \leq 1$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, i.e. $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, C_2\}$ almost cuts every E_n into half. Then for each of $\mathcal{T}_{\min}(\mathcal{E})$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{ort}}(\mathcal{E})$, the colouring $\mathcal{C}$ is indecisive; but for $\mathcal{T}_{\max}(\mathcal{E})$ it is decisive.

The following theorem tells us, loosely speaking, that either we are in the highly fragmented case, or we are in the decisive case.

THEOREM 4.5 (Dichotomy for spreads). *Let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ be a union-closed set system. Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a spread in Ω. At least one of the following conclusions holds:*

(D1) *there is a spread $\mathcal{G}$ that refines $\mathcal{E}$, and a sequence $(\mathsf{a}_i)_{i \geq 1}$ in $\mathcal{S}$ which shatters $\mathcal{G}$;*

(D2) *there is a spread $\mathcal{F}$ that refines $\mathcal{E}$, and a colouring $\mathcal{C}$ of $\mathcal{F}$, such that $\mathcal{C}$ decides $\mathcal{S}$ with respect to $\mathcal{F}$.*

Moreover: if Case (D1) holds, then for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ the set system $\{\mathsf{a}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{a}_m\}$ has size m and is incompressible.

The proof requires a double induction, and we isolate part of it as a separate lemma. The following terminology is introduced to streamline the presentation.

DEFINITION 4.6. Let $\mathcal{E} = (E_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a spread, and let D and F be subsets of Ω. We say that F *halves* D with respect to $\mathcal{E}$ if

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} |D \cap F \cap E_n| = \lim_{n \to \infty} |(D \setminus F) \cap E_n| = \infty \, .$$

LEMMA 4.7. *Let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ be union-closed. Let $\mathcal{E} = (E_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a spread in Ω, and let $\mathcal{C}$ be a colouring of $\mathcal{E}$. Then at least one of the following conclusions holds:*

(i) *there is an infinite set $N \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ and some $\mathsf{y} \in \mathcal{S}$ which halves C with respect to $(E_n)_{n \in N}$ for every $C \in \mathcal{C}$;*

(ii) *there is a spread $\mathcal{F} = (F_j)_{j \geq 1}$ which refines $\mathcal{E}$, such that $\mathcal{C}$ decides $\mathcal{S}$ with respect to $\mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. The idea is as follows: we attempt to construct, by iteration, members of $\mathcal{S}$ that are closer and closer to satisfying the property in Case (i). At each stage of the iteration, we will be able to continue, unless we find ourselves in Case (ii). Therefore, if Case (ii) does not hold, our iteration will run successfully until Case (i) is satisfied.

Assume from now on that Case (ii) does not hold, and enumerate the members of $\mathcal{C}$ as $C_1, \dots, C_d$. Since $\mathcal{C}$ does not decide $\mathcal{S}$ with respect to $\mathcal{E}$, there exists $\mathsf{y}_1 \in \mathcal{S}$ such that

$$\sup_n \min\{|\mathsf{y}_1 \cap C_1 \cap E_n| \; ; \; |{\mathsf{y}_1}^c \cap C_j \cap E_n| \; , \; 1 \leq j \leq d\} = +\infty$$

Passing to an appropriate subsequence, there exists an infinite $N_1 \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that:

- $|\mathsf{y}_1 \cap C_1 \cap E_n| \to \infty$ along $n \in N_1$; and
- $|{\mathsf{y}_1}^c \cap C_j \cap E_n| \to \infty$ along $n \in N_1$ for every $1 \leq j \leq d$.

Now let $2 \leq k \leq d$. Suppose we have found $\mathsf{y}_{k-1} \in \mathcal{S}$ and an infinite subset $N_{k-1} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that:

(i) $|\mathsf{y}_{k-1} \cap C_i \cap E_n| \to \infty$ along $n \in N_{k-1}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k-1$; and

(ii) $|{\mathsf{y}_{k-1}}^c \cap C_j \cap E_n| \to \infty$ along $n \in N_{k-1}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq d$.

(We think of the first condition as saying that $\mathsf{y}_{k-1} \cap C_i$ is "not too sparse" relative to the spread $(E_n)_{n \in N_{k-1}}$, for $1 \leq i \leq k-1$; and the second condition as saying that $\mathsf{y}_{k-1} \cap C_j$ is "not too dense" relative to the same spread, for all j.)

Note that we might have ${\mathsf{y}_{k-1}}^c \cap E_m = \emptyset$ for some $m \in N_{k-1}$. However, because of (ii), we can assume (after replacing N_{k-1} with some cofinal subset, if necessary) that the sequence $({\mathsf{y}_{k-1}}^c \cap E_n)_{n \in N_{k-1}}$ is a spread in Ω, which we denote by $\mathcal{E}_k$. By construction, $\mathcal{E}_k$ refines $\mathcal{E}$, and by condition (ii) again, $\mathcal{C}$ colours $\mathcal{E}_k$. Since $\mathcal{C}$ does not decide $\mathcal{S}$ with respect to $\mathcal{E}_k$, the colour class C_k must be indecisive. By the same reasoning as before, there exists some $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$ and an infinite subset $N_k \subseteq N_{k-1}$ such that:

(iii) $|\mathsf{x} \cap C_k \cap ({\mathsf{y}_{k-1}}^c \cap E_n)| \to \infty$ along $n \in N_k$; and

(iv) $|\mathsf{x}^c \cap C_j \cap ({\mathsf{y}_{k-1}}^c \cap E_n)| \to \infty$ along $n \in N_k$, for every $1 \leq j \leq d$.

Let $\mathsf{y}_k := \mathsf{y}_{k-1} \cup \mathsf{x}$, which belongs to $\mathcal{S}$ since $\mathcal{S}$ is union-closed. Since $N_k \subseteq N_{k-1}$ and $\mathsf{y}_k \supseteq \mathsf{y}_{k-1}$, condition (i) implies

$$|\mathsf{y}_k \cap C_i \cap E_n| \to \infty \text{ along } n \in N_k, \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq k-1 \; ;$$

and since $\mathsf{y}_k \supseteq \mathsf{x}$, condition (iii) implies

$$|\mathsf{y}_k \cap C_k \cap E_n| \to \infty \text{ along } n \in N_k \; .$$

But by the definition of y_k, condition (iv) can be rephrased as

$$|{\mathsf{y}_k}^c \cap C_j \cap E_n| \to \infty \text{ along } n \in N_k, \text{ for every } 1 \leq j \leq d \; .$$

Thus the induction can continue. We end up with $\mathsf{y}_d \in \mathcal{S}$ and an infinite subset $N_d \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that y_d halves C_j with respect to $(E_n)_{n \in N_d}$ for every $1 \leq j \leq d$, concluding the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 4.5. Suppose that Case (D2) of the theorem does not hold. Given $\mathsf{x}_1, \dots, \mathsf{x}_m \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$, let $\Gamma(\mathsf{x}_1, \dots, \mathsf{x}_m)$ denote the collection of all sets of the form $\bigcap_{j=1}^m \mathsf{y}_j$ where $\mathsf{y}_j \in \{\mathsf{x}_j, \mathsf{x}_j^c\}$ for each $j = 1, \dots, m$. Note that $\Gamma(\mathsf{x}_1, \dots, \mathsf{x}_m)$ is a partition of Ω, but some members of the partition might be empty.

Now let $\mathcal{E}_0 = \mathcal{E}$ and let $\mathcal{C}_0$ denote the trivial colouring $\{\Omega\}$. Apply Lemma 4.7 to the pair $(\mathcal{E}_0, \mathcal{C}_0)$. Case (ii) of the lemma does not hold, since otherwise we would be in case D2 of the theorem. Hence we are in Case (i) of the lemma, so there exists an infinite set $N_1 \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ and some $\mathsf{a}_1 \in \mathcal{S}$ which halves Ω with respect to $(E_n)_{n \in N_1}$.

Suppose that for some $k \geq 1$, we have found $\mathsf{a}_1, \dots, \mathsf{a}_k \in \mathcal{S}$ and an infinite subset $N_k \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, such that $\Gamma(\mathsf{a}_1, \dots, \mathsf{a}_k)$ colours the spread $(E_n)_{n \in N_k}$. This colouring cannot be decisive for $\mathcal{S}$ (otherwise we would be in Case (D2) of the theorem, contrary to assumption) and so by Lemma 4.7 there exists some infinite $N_{k+1} \subseteq N_k$ and some $\mathsf{a}_{k+1} \in \mathcal{S}$ which halves C with respect to $(E_n)_{n \in N_{k+1}}$ for each $C \in \Gamma(\mathsf{a}_1, \dots, \mathsf{a}_k)$. Now $\Gamma(\mathsf{a}_1, \dots, \mathsf{a}_{k+1})$ is a colouring of the spread $(E_n)_{n \in N_{k+1}}$.

Continuing in this way, we inductively construct a sequence $(\mathsf{a}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ in $\mathcal{S}$, and a descending chain of infinite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$, $N_1 \supseteq N_2 \supseteq \dots$, such that:

$$\text{for each } m \geq 1 \text{ and each } C \in \Gamma(\mathsf{a}_1, \dots, \mathsf{a}_m),\ |C \cap E_n| \to \infty \text{ along } n \in N_m.$$

Since $N_1 \supseteq N_2 \supseteq \dots$ is a decreasing sequence of infinite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$, we can extract a diagonal subsequence $n(1) < n(2) < n(3) < \dots$ satisfying $n(k) \in N_j$ for every $j \leq k$. Thus for each m, $(n(i))_{i \geq m}$ is a subsequence of N_m, and so for $C \in \Gamma(\mathsf{a}_1, \dots, \mathsf{a}_m)$ we have $\lim_{i \to \infty} |C \cap E_{n(i)}| = \lim_{N_m \ni n \to \infty} |C \cap E_n| = \infty$. Therefore, if we define $G_i = E_{n(i)}$, the sequence $(G_i)_{i \geq 1}$ is a spread which is shattered by the sequence $(\mathsf{a}_j)_{j \geq 1}$, and we are in Case (D1) as required.

The final part of the theorem is immediate from the definition of shattering and Remark 2.11. □

Combining Proposition 4.2 with the final part of Theorem 4.5, we obtain the following result.

Corollary 4.8. *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a semilattice of infinite breadth. If we are in Case (D1) of Theorem 4.5, then there exists a spread $\mathcal{E}'$ such that $\mathcal{S} \not\boxtimes \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{E}') \supseteq \mathcal{T}_{\max}(\mathcal{E}')$.*

The point of this corollary will become clearer in later sections. When combined with the structure theorem (Theorem 3.10), the corollary implies that if we do not have $\mathcal{T}_{\max}$ or $\mathcal{T}_{\min}$ configurations, not only do we have a $\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{ort}}$ configuration on some spread $\mathcal{E}_3$, but we must be in Case (D2) of the dichotomy theorem. This extra control will be crucial to some of our later results.

5 Stable filters in weighted semilattices

In this section, we move back to the setting of abstract semilattices.

5.1 The filter stability problem

A *filter* in a semilattice S is a nonempty subset $F \subseteq S$ which is closed under taking binary products and under taking factors (that is, if $x \in S$, $y \in F$ and $xy = y$, then $x \in F$). Filters are important structures in semilattices, as they can be naturally identified with nonzero multiplicative functions on S, by the following observation: if $\emptyset \neq F \subseteq S$, then F is a filter if and only if it has the following "filter property":

$$\forall\, x, y \in S \quad (xy \in F \iff x, y \in F).$$

We shall apply the results of the previous sections to study stability of filters for weighted semilattices. It was implicitly observed in [Cho13] that stability of filters can be used to answer questions about stability of the character space for certain Banach algebras; further details will be given in Section 7.

To study stability of filters, we consider two natural methods to quantify the concept of a filter in a weighted semilattice (S, ω), one local and one global. If G is a subset of S then its *filter defect* is defined to be

$$\mathrm{def}_\omega(G) = \sup_{x,y \in S} \frac{|1_G(xy) - 1_G(x)1_G(y)|}{\omega(x)\omega(y)}\,, \tag{7}$$

where 1_G denotes the characteristic function of G. Thus the filter defect measures, via "local" observations, to what extent the filter property fails when checked at every pair of elements in (S, ω). Note that $\mathrm{def}_\omega(G) = 0$ if and only if G is empty or is a filter. For a "global" measurement of the failure of the filter property for G, we take the weighted distance of G from the collection $\mathcal{F}$ of all filters of S, also allowing $\emptyset$. Let $F, G \subseteq S$, and define

$$\mathrm{dist}_\omega(F, G) = \sup_{x \in S} \frac{|1_F(x) - 1_G(x)|}{\omega(x)}\,.$$

Then define $\mathrm{dist}_\omega(G, \mathcal{F} \cup \{\emptyset\})$ as an infimum in the usual way. Note that the contribution of different points of S to def_ω or dist_ω of $G \subseteq S$ depends (reciprocally) on their weight.

Suppose (G_n) is a sequence in $\mathcal{P}(S)$ satisfying $\mathrm{dist}_\omega(G_n, \mathcal{F} \cup \{\emptyset\}) \to 0$. Then straightforward calculations show that $\mathrm{def}_\omega(G_n) \to 0$; informally, if you get nearer and nearer to a genuine filter, you look more and more like a filter. The filter stability problem (for weighted semilattices) asks if the converse holds, i.e. whether the local and global measurements for the filtering property are compatible.

Definition 5.1. Let S be a semilattice and let ω be a weight. We say that S has *ω-stable filters* if every sequence $(G_n) \subset \mathcal{P}(S)$ with $\mathrm{def}_\omega(G_n) \to 0$ satisfies $\mathrm{dist}_\omega(G_n, \mathcal{F} \cup \{\emptyset\}) \to 0$.

5.2 Characterizations of stability of filters

In this section we shall give a criterion which is equivalent to the property of having stable filters, but which is often easier to check for particular examples, since it does not require prior knowledge of all the filters in a given semilattice.

Notation. Let (S, ω) be a semilattice, and let $\lambda = \log \circ \omega$ be the associated log-weight. We write $\mathrm{fac}(E)$ for the set of factors of elements of E, or more formally,

$$\mathrm{fac}(E) := \bigcup_{y \in E} \{x \in S : \ x \succeq y\}. \tag{8}$$

If E is a non-empty subset of S and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$\langle E \rangle_n := \{x_1 \cdots x_n : \ x_1, \ldots, x_n \in E\}.$$

Let $\mathrm{Filt}(E)$ denote the filter generated by E, i.e. the smallest filter in S which contains E. It is easy to verify that

$$\mathrm{Filt}(E) = \mathrm{fac}\left(\bigcup_{n \geq 1} \langle E \rangle_n\right) = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \mathrm{fac}(\langle E \rangle_n). \tag{9}$$

For the log-weight $\lambda : S \to [0, \infty)$ on the semilattice S, define

$$W_L(S, \lambda) = \{x \in S \colon \lambda(x) \leq L\};$$

when there is no danger of confusion we abbreviate this to W_L. Let $C \geq 0$. For $X \subseteq S$ we define $\mathrm{FBP}_C(E) := \mathrm{fac}(\langle E \rangle_2) \cap W_C$; in other words

$$\mathrm{FBP}_C(E) := \{z \in W_C \colon \text{there exist } x, y \in E \text{ such that } z \succeq xy\}.$$

(FBP stands for "factors of binary products".) For sake of book-keeping, we note that $\mathrm{FBP}_C(\emptyset) = \emptyset$.

Definition 5.2. Let $X \subseteq S$. We say X is FBP_C*-stable* if $\mathrm{FBP}_C(X \cap W_C) = X \cap W_C$.

The notion of FBP-stability for a set has close connections to its filter defect, as described in the following lemma.

Lemma 5.3. *Let S be a semilattice.*

(i) *Let $C \geq 0$ and suppose $X \subseteq S$ is FBP_C-stable. Then $\mathrm{def}_\omega(X) \leq e^{-C}$.*

(ii) *Let $X \subseteq S$ and $C \geq 0$. If $\mathrm{def}_\omega(X) < e^{-3C}$, then X is FBP_C-stable.*

Proof of (i). Let $x, y \in S$: we must show that $|1_X(xy) - 1_X(x)1_X(y)| \leq e^{-C}\omega(x)\omega(y)$. If $\lambda(x) + \lambda(y) \geq C$, then the inequality follows since

$$|1_X(xy) - 1_X(x)1_X(y)| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \leq e^{-C}e^{\lambda(x)+\lambda(y)} = e^{-C}\omega(x)\omega(y).$$

Suppose, then, that $\lambda(x) + \lambda(y) \leq C$. We will show that in fact this forces $1_X(xy) = 1_X(x)1_X(y)$.

First, note that x, y and xy all belong to W_C. Now observe:

– if x and y are in X, then xy is a factor of the product of two things in $X \cap W_C$, so by FBP_C-stability it belongs to X;

– if xy lies in X, then both x and y are factors of something in $X \cap W_C$, so by FBP_C-stability both belong to X.

Thus $xy \in X$ if and only if x and y belong to X. □

Proof of (ii). If $X \cap W_C = \emptyset$ then we are done. So suppose $X \cap W_C \neq \emptyset$. Let $x, y \in X \cap W_C$. Suppose $z \in W_C$ and $z \succeq xy$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |1_X(xy) - 1_X(x)1_X(y)| &\leq \mathrm{def}_\omega(X)\omega(x)\omega(y) \quad &\leq \mathrm{def}_\omega(X)e^{2C} < 1, \\ |1_X(xy) - 1_X(xy)1_X(z)| &\leq \mathrm{def}_\omega(X)\omega(xy)\omega(z) \quad &\leq \mathrm{def}_\omega(X)e^{3C} < 1. \end{aligned}$$

Since $1_X(x) = 1 = 1_X(y)$, the first formula implies $1_X(xy) = 1$; feeding this into the second formula we conclude that $z \in X$. This shows that $\mathrm{FBP}_C(X \cap W_C) \subseteq X \cap W_C$, and the converse inclusion is trivial. □

An obvious way to obtain FBP_C-stable sets is by iteration. For $k \geq 2$ we recursively define $\mathrm{FBP}_C^k(X) = \mathrm{FBP}_C\left(\mathrm{FBP}_C^{k-1}(X)\right)$, noting that

$$X \cap W_C \subseteq \mathrm{FBP}_C(X) \subseteq \mathrm{FBP}_C^2(X) \subseteq \mathrm{FBP}_C^3(X) \subseteq \dots$$

We define $\mathrm{FBP}_C^\infty(X)$ to be the inductive limit $\bigcup_{k\geq 1} \mathrm{FBP}_C(X)$. By induction, we have

$$\mathrm{FBP}_C^\infty(X) \subseteq \mathrm{Filt}(X) \cap W_C \quad \text{for all } X \subseteq S \text{ such that } X \cap W_C \neq \emptyset \tag{10}$$

For a given X and C, the inclusion in (10) can be proper, since when constructing $\mathrm{FBP}_C^\infty(X)$ we are only allowed to take binary products at each stage, and only allowed to consider factors which have log-weight at most C. On the other hand, if E is non-empty and $z \in \mathrm{Filt}(E)$, then there exists $C \geq 0$, possibly depending on z, such that $z \in \mathrm{FBP}_C^\infty(E)$. (For instance, if $x_1, \dots, x_k \in E$ and $z \succeq x_1 \cdots x_k$ then $C = \max\{\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda(x_i), \lambda(z)\}$ suffices. These considerations lead naturally to the following definition.

Definition 5.4 (Propagation). For $z \in \mathrm{Filt}\, E$, let

$$V_E(z) = \inf\{C \geq 0 \colon z \in \mathrm{FBP}_C^\infty(E)\}.$$

Given $L \geq 0$, we say that (S, λ) *propagates at level* L, or *has* L*-propagation*, if

$$\sup_{\emptyset \neq E \subseteq W_L} \sup_{z \in \mathrm{Filt}(E) \cap W_L} V_E(z) < \infty\,.$$

Note that if (S, λ) propagates at a level L, then so does it at every lower level. Also, in the above formula, we could restrict E to the finite subsets of W_L without altering the value of the double supremum.

Understanding the behaviour of V_E is the key to showing instability of filters for certain log-weights. If $V_E(z)$ is large, then to obtain z from E by repeatedly taking factors of binary products, we must allow elements with large log-weight along the way, even if z itself has small log-weight. It is convenient to set $V_E(z) := +\infty$ whenever $z \notin \mathrm{Filt}(E)$. Note for future reference that $V_E(z) \geq \lambda(z)$.

We now give equivalent conditions for stability of filters of (S, ω).

THEOREM 5.5. *Let ω be a weight on a semilattice S. The following are equivalent.*

(i) *S has ω-stable filters.*

(ii) *$\forall\ \varepsilon > 0\ \exists\ \delta > 0$ such that, if $G \subseteq S$ satisfies $\mathrm{def}_\omega(G) < \delta$, then $\exists\ F \subseteq S$ such that $F \in \mathcal{F} \cup \{\emptyset\}$ and $\mathrm{dist}_\omega(G, F) < \varepsilon$.*

(iii) *Let $\lambda = \log \circ \omega$. Then (S, λ) has L-propagation for all $L \geq 0$.*

Proof. The equivalence of (i) and (ii) is trivial. We now prove (iii)⇒(ii). Suppose (S, λ) has L-propagation for every $L \geq 0$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given, and consider a fixed positive number $L > \ln(\varepsilon^{-1})$. From the definition of L-propagation, choose a positive real number $C > L$ such that

$$C \geq \sup_{\emptyset \neq E \subseteq W_L} \sup_{z \in \mathrm{Filt}(E) \cap W_L} V_E(z),$$

this is possible as the double supremum is finite by assumption. Finally, let $\delta := e^{-6C}$.

Suppose G is a subset of S for which $\mathrm{def}_\omega(G) < \delta$. Then by Lemma 5.3, G is FBP_{2C}-stable, i.e. $\mathrm{FBP}_{2C}(G \cap W_{2C}) = G \cap W_{2C}$. If $G \cap W_L = \emptyset$ then $\mathrm{dist}_\omega(G, \emptyset) < 1/e^L < \varepsilon$, and we are done. So suppose that $G \cap W_L \neq \emptyset$, and let $F = \mathrm{Filt}(G \cap W_L)$. Note that by definition of C, we have

$$F \cap W_L \subseteq \mathrm{FBP}^\infty_{2C}(G \cap W_L).$$

On the other hand,

$$\mathrm{FBP}^\infty_{2C}(G \cap W_L) \cap W_L \subseteq \mathrm{FBP}^\infty_{2C}(G \cap W_{2C}) \cap W_L = G \cap W_{2C} \cap W_L = G \cap W_L.$$

So, $G \cap W_L \subseteq F \cap W_L \subseteq G \cap W_L$, which implies that $G \cap W_L = F \cap W_L$ and $\mathrm{dist}_\omega(F, G) < 1/e^L < \varepsilon$.

Finally, we prove (ii)⇒(iii). Let $\lambda = \log \circ \omega$ be the log-weight, and let $L > 0$ be given. Set $\varepsilon := e^{-L}$, and let $\delta < 2e^{-L}$ be chosen so that it satisfies Condition (ii). Put $C = -\log \frac{\delta}{2}$, and note that $C > L$. Let E be a non-empty subset of W_L, and put $X = \mathrm{FBP}^\infty_C(E)$. It suffices to show that $\mathrm{Filt}(E) \cap W_L \subseteq X$ (since this implies the supremum in Definition 5.4 is $\leq C$ and hence finite). Note that X is non-empty (since $X \cap W_L$ contains E) and FBP_C-stable. Hence by Lemma 5.3, we have

$$\mathrm{def}_\omega(X) \leq e^{-C} = \frac{\delta}{2} < \delta.$$

Since (S, ω) satisfies (ii), there exists $G \in \mathcal{F} \cup \{\emptyset\}$ such that $\mathrm{dist}_\omega(X, G) < \varepsilon = 1/e^L$. This means that $X \cap W_L = G \cap W_L$. But since $E \subseteq X \cap W_L$, this implies that G contains E and hence contains $\mathrm{Filt}(E)$. Therefore $\mathrm{Filt}(E) \cap W_L \subseteq G \cap W_L = X \cap W_L \subseteq X$, as required. □

5.3 Infinite breadth and instability of filters

Suppose S is a semilattice with finite breadth. It is not hard, given Theorem 5.5, to show that (S, ω) has stable filters for *every* choice of submultiplicative weight $\omega : S \to [1, \infty)$. This was implicitly observed in [Cho13, Example 3.13 and Theorem 3.14]. The main result of this section is that the converse holds.

THEOREM 5.6. *Let S be a semilattice with infinite breadth. Then there is a log-weight λ on $\mathcal{S}$ such that (S, λ) does not have 1-propagation.*

COROLLARY 5.7. *Let S be a semilattice with infinite breadth. Then there exists a submultiplicative weight $\omega : S \to [1, \infty)$ such that S does not have ω-stable filters.*

The proof of Theorem 5.6 uses both the structure theorem and the dichotomy theorem, and will be given in the next section. To motivate the ideas in the proof, we first give a proof for $S = \mathcal{P}^{\text{fin}}(\Omega)$ on any infinite set Ω (Proposition 5.9). The arguments used serve as a prototype for what we shall do in the proof of Theorem 5.6, but do not require the structure theory from earlier sections.

The key idea occurs at the level of finite subsets. Let Ω_{00} be a finite set and consider the union-closed set system $\mathcal{P}_*(\Omega_{00})$. Define

$$\lambda(\mathsf{z}) := |\mathsf{z}| \text{ if } \mathsf{z} \subsetneq \Omega_{00} \quad , \quad \lambda(\Omega_{00}) := 0. \qquad (\mathsf{z} \in \mathcal{P}_*(\Omega_{00})). \tag{11}$$

It is easily checked that λ is a log-weight. Let $\mathcal{E} = \{\{\omega\} : \omega \in \Omega_{00}\}$, and note that $\mathcal{E} = W_1(\lambda)$ and $\{\Omega_{00}\} = W_0(\lambda) \subseteq W_1(\lambda)$.

Intuitively, the constraint in the FBP_C operation that we can only multiply elements of log-weight $\leq C$ creates a kind of barrier that prevents us getting near to $\text{join}(\mathcal{E})$; since we arranged that $\text{join}(\mathcal{E}) \in W_1(\lambda)$, there is an obstruction to propagation. More precisely, we have the following lemma.

LEMMA 5.8. $V_{\mathcal{E}}(\Omega_{00}) \geq \frac{1}{2}|\Omega_{00}|$.

Proof. Let $C \geq 1$ be such that $\Omega_{00} \in \text{FBP}_C^\infty(\mathcal{E})$. Note that $\Omega_{00} \notin \mathcal{E} = \text{FBP}_C^0(\mathcal{E})$. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be minimal such that $\Omega_{00} \in \text{FBP}_C^m(\mathcal{E})$. Then there exist $\mathsf{a}_1, \mathsf{a}_2 \in \text{FBP}_C^{m-1}(\mathcal{E})$ such that $\Omega_{00} \subseteq \mathsf{a}_1 \cup \mathsf{a}_2$; by minimality of m, both a_1 and a_2 are proper subsets of Ω_{00}, and so

$$|\Omega_{00}| \leq |\mathsf{a}_1| + |\mathsf{a}_2| = \lambda(\mathsf{a}_1) + \lambda(\mathsf{a}_2) \leq 2C.$$

Hence $2V_E(\Omega_{00}) \geq |\Omega_{00}|$, as required. □

PROPOSITION 5.9. *Let Ω be an infinite set, and let $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{P}_*^{\text{fin}}(\Omega)$. Then there is a log-weight $\lambda : \mathcal{S} \to [0, \infty)$ such that $(\mathcal{S}, \lambda)$ does not have 1-propagation.*

Proof. Fix a spread $\mathcal{E} = (E_n)_{n \geq 1}$ in Ω. Let $\Omega_0 = \text{join}(\mathcal{E}) \subseteq \Omega$.

Define $C(\mathsf{x}) := \{n \in \mathbb{N} : E_n \subseteq \mathsf{x}\}$. Now define $\lambda : \mathcal{P}_*^{\text{fin}}(\Omega) \to [0, \infty)$ by

$$\lambda(\mathsf{x}) := |\mathsf{x} \setminus \bigcup_{n \in C(\mathsf{x})} E_n| \, .$$

That is, we throw away all the E_n which are contained in x, and then we count the number of remaining elements.

Given $\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{y} \in \mathcal{P}_*^{\text{fin}}(\Omega)$ we have $C(\mathsf{x} \cup \mathsf{y}) \supseteq C(\mathsf{x}) \cup C(\mathsf{y})$, and so

$$(\mathsf{x} \cup \mathsf{y}) \setminus \left(\bigcup\nolimits_{n \in C(\mathsf{x} \cup \mathsf{y})} E_n \right) \subseteq \left(\mathsf{x} \setminus \bigcup\nolimits_{n \in C(\mathsf{x})} E_n \right) \cup \left(\mathsf{y} \setminus \bigcup\nolimits_{n \in C(\mathsf{y})} E_n \right).$$

Hence $\lambda(\mathsf{x} \cup \mathsf{y}) \leq \lambda(\mathsf{x}) + \lambda(\mathsf{y})$, and so we have a valid log-weight.

To show failure of 1-propagation, we construct a sequence $(\mathcal{E}_n)$ in W_1 such that

$$\sup_{\mathsf{z} \in \mathrm{Filt}(\mathcal{E}_n) \cap W_1} V_{\mathcal{E}_n}(\mathsf{z}) \to \infty.$$

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{E}_n = \{\{\delta\} \colon \delta \in E_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ and note that $\mathrm{join}(\mathcal{E}_n) = E_n$. Note also that if $\mathsf{a} \in \mathrm{Filt}(\mathcal{E}_n)$ then $\mathsf{a} \subseteq E_n$, and if a is a proper subset of E_n then $\lambda(\mathsf{a}) = |\mathsf{a}|$. We have $\mathcal{E}_n \subset W_1$ and $E_n \in \mathrm{Filt}(\mathcal{E}_n) \cap W_0 \subseteq \mathrm{Filt}(\mathcal{E}_n) \cap W_1$. Now, let $C \geq 0$ be such that $E_n \in \mathrm{FBP}^{\infty}_{C}(\mathcal{E}_n)$. By the same "barrier argument" as in the proof of Lemma 5.8, we deduce that $|E_n| \leq 2C$. Thus $V_{\mathcal{E}_n}(E_n) \geq \frac{1}{2}|E_n|$, which by assumption tends to infinity as $n \to \infty$. □

6 The proof of Theorem 5.6

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a semilattice with infinite breadth. By the Cayley embedding, we can always assume that $\mathcal{S}$ is a subsemilattice of $(\mathcal{P}(\Omega), \cup)$ for some set Ω. The following remark will be useful later on.

Remark 6.1. Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$. Then any factor of any product of members of $\mathcal{F}$ is a subset of $\mathrm{join}(\mathcal{F})$. That is,

$$\mathrm{Filt}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{F}) \subseteq \mathrm{Filt}_{\mathcal{P}(\Omega)}(\mathcal{F}) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathrm{join}(\mathcal{F})).$$

By Theorem 3.10, there are three cases that should be considered in the proof of Theorem 5.6. In each case, we define a suitable log-weight on $\mathcal{S}$ using the subquotient structure (MAX, MIN or ORT) present in it. Note that it is relatively easy to construct log-weights on these subquotients for which propagation fails; and log-weights on quotients of $\mathcal{S}$ pull back to give log-weights on $\mathcal{S}$ itself. However, not every log-weight on a substructure of $\mathcal{S}$ can be extended to a log-weight on $\mathcal{S}$. (This fact is one of the major sources of difficulty in proving Theorem 5.6; another subtlety is that having L-propagation need not pass to substructures or quotient structures, as will be seen in Section 7.2.)

6.1 Proof of Theorem 5.6: Case I

Suppose that there exists a spread $\mathcal{E} = (E_n)_{n \geq 1}$ in Ω such that $\mathcal{S} \not\boxtimes \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{E})$ contains $\mathcal{T}_{\max}(\mathcal{E})$. For each $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$, define

$$\lambda(\mathsf{x}) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if there are } \textit{no} \text{ or } \textit{infinitely many } n \text{ such that } E_n \cap \mathsf{x} \neq \emptyset \\ 0 & \text{if } E_n \subseteq \mathsf{x} \\ |\mathsf{x} \cap E_n| & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

where in the last two cases n is the *largest* natural number such that $E_n \cap \mathsf{x} \neq \emptyset$.

Lemma 6.2. *Let* $\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{y} \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$. *Then* $\lambda(\mathsf{x} \cup \mathsf{y}) \leq \lambda(\mathsf{x}) + \lambda(\mathsf{y})$.

Proof. Fix $\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{y} \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$. In the following, any case where some condition on x is satisfied has a corresponding case for y, which is simply omitted.

The case when $\mathsf{x} \cap \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{E}) = \emptyset$ (or $\mathsf{y} \cap \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{E}) = \emptyset$) is obvious.

If there are infinitely many n such that $E_n \cap \mathsf{x} \neq \emptyset$, then the same is true for $\mathsf{x} \cup \mathsf{y}$, and so the inequality follows, since $\lambda(\mathsf{y}) \geq 0$.

Otherwise, let m be the largest natural number such that $E_m \cap \mathsf{x} \neq \emptyset$, and let n be the corresponding number for y. If $m \neq n$, then without loss of generality we suppose $m > n$. Then m is also the largest number such that $E_m \cap (\mathsf{x} \cup \mathsf{y}) \neq \emptyset$, and moreover

$$E_m \cap (\mathsf{x} \cup \mathsf{y}) = E_m \cap \mathsf{x}\,,$$

so the inequality follows, since $\lambda(\mathsf{y}) \geq 0$. Otherwise, $m = n$ is the largest number such that $E_m \cap (\mathsf{x} \cup \mathsf{y}) \neq \emptyset$. If furthermore $E_m \subseteq \mathsf{x}$, then $E_m \subseteq \mathsf{x} \cup \mathsf{y}$, and the inequality is again obvious. Otherwise, we see that

$$\lambda(\mathsf{x} \cup \mathsf{y}) \leq |(\mathsf{x} \cup \mathsf{y}) \cap E_m| \leq |\mathsf{x} \cap E_m| + |\mathsf{y} \cap E_m| = \lambda(\mathsf{x}) + \lambda(\mathsf{y})\,.$$

This completes the proof. □

We will now show that $(\mathcal{S}, \lambda)$ does not have 1-propagation.

Proof. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\mathcal{S} \boxtimes \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{E})$ contains $\mathcal{T}_{\max}(\mathcal{E})$, there is a size-$n$ subset $\mathcal{F}_n \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ such that:

- for each $\mathsf{a} \in \mathcal{F}_n$, $E_j \subseteq \mathsf{a}$ for $j < n$, $\mathsf{a} \cap E_n$ is a singleton, and $\mathsf{a} \cap E_j = \emptyset$ for $j > n$;
- $\mathsf{a} \cap E_n$ gives different singletons for different $\mathsf{a} \in \mathcal{F}_n$.

From our construction, $\lambda(\mathsf{a}) = 1$ for every $\mathsf{a} \in \mathcal{F}_n$.

Set $\mathsf{b}_n := \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{F}_n)$. Then $\lambda(\mathsf{b}_n) = 0$, and so $\mathsf{b}_n \in \mathrm{Filt}(\mathcal{F}_n) \wedge W_1$. To finish the proof it suffices to show that $V_{\mathcal{F}_n}(\mathsf{b}_n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$, which we do using our barrier argument (cf. the proof of Lemma 5.8). Let $C \geq 1$ be such that $\mathsf{b}_n \in \mathrm{FBP}^{\infty}_{C}(\mathcal{F}_n)$. Let $m \geq 1$ be minimal with respect to the property

$$\text{there exists } \mathsf{a} \in \mathrm{FBP}^{m}_{C}(\mathcal{F}_n) \text{ which contains } E_n \tag{$*$}$$

(such an m exists by our assumption, since $E_n \subseteq \mathsf{b}_n$). By minimality there exist $\mathsf{a}_1, \mathsf{a}_2 \in \mathrm{FBP}^{m-1}_{C}(\mathcal{F}_n)$ such that E_n is contained in $\mathsf{a}_1 \cup \mathsf{a}_2$, yet $E_n \not\subseteq \mathsf{a}_1$ and $E_n \not\subseteq \mathsf{a}_2$; when $m = 1$, our convention here is that $\mathrm{FBP}^{0}_{C}(\mathcal{F}_n) = \mathcal{F}_n$. Thus $\mathsf{a}_i \cap E_n$ are proper nonempty subsets of E_n. By Remark 6.1, a_1 and a_2 are also subsets of b_n. Thus n is the largest natural number k such that $\mathsf{a}_i \cap E_k \neq \emptyset$, and we see that $\lambda(\mathsf{a}_i) = |\mathsf{a}_i \cap E_n|$. Hence $|E_n| \leq \lambda(\mathsf{a}_1) + \lambda(\mathsf{a}_2) \leq 2C$, with the last inequality following because $\mathsf{a}_1, \mathsf{a}_2 \in W_C$.

Therefore, $V_{\mathcal{F}_n}(\mathsf{b}_n) \geq \frac{1}{2}|E_n| \to 0$, completing the proof. □

6.2 Proof of Theorem 5.6: Case II

This case is similar (and somewhat easier than) the first case. Suppose that there exists a spread $\mathcal{E} = (E_n)_{n \geq 1}$ in Ω such that $\mathcal{S} \boxtimes \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{E})$ contains $\mathcal{T}_{\min}(\mathcal{E})$. Then, for each $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$, define

$$\lambda(\mathsf{x}) := \begin{cases} 0 & \mathsf{x} \cap \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{E}) = \emptyset \\ 0 & \text{if } E_n \subseteq \mathsf{x} \\ |\mathsf{x} \cap E_n| & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases} \tag{13}$$

where in the last two cases n is the *smallest* natural number such that $E_n \cap \mathsf{x} \neq \emptyset$.

LEMMA 6.3. *In this case, λ is a log-weight on $\mathcal{S}$, and $(\mathcal{S}, \lambda)$ does not have 1-propagation.*

Proof. This is similar to Case I. □

6.3 Proof of Theorem 5.6: Case III

In this final case, we suppose that $\mathcal{S}$ has infinite breadth, and that there is no spread $\mathcal{E}$ for which $\mathcal{S} \boxtimes \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{E})$ contains either $\mathcal{T}_{\max}(\mathcal{E})$ or $\mathcal{T}_{\min}(\mathcal{E})$. By the main structure theorem (Theorem 3.10), there exists a spread $\mathcal{E}'$ such that $\mathcal{S} \boxtimes \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{E}') \supseteq \mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{ort}}(\mathcal{E}')$. By the dichotomy theorem (Theorem 4.5) together with Corollary 4.8, there is a spread $\mathcal{E}$ that refines $\mathcal{E}'$, and a colouring $\mathcal{C}$ which decides $\mathcal{S}$ with respect to $\mathcal{E}$. Note also that $\mathcal{S} \boxtimes \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{E}) \supseteq \mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{ort}}(\mathcal{E})$.

LEMMA 6.4 (Creating a log-weight from a decisive colouring). *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a subsemilattice of $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ and let $\mathcal{E} = (E_n)_{n\geq 1}$ be a spread in Ω. Suppose there is a colouring $\mathcal{C}$ that decides $\mathcal{S}$ with respect to $\mathcal{E}$, with a decisive colour class C_0.*

For each $\mathsf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$ define

$$T(\mathsf{x}) = \{n \in \mathbb{N} \colon |\mathsf{x} \cap C \cap E_n| \leq \frac{1}{2}|C \cap E_n| \text{ for all } C \in \mathcal{C}\}$$

and define $\lambda(\mathsf{x}) = \sup_{n\in T(\mathsf{x})} |\mathsf{x} \cap C_0 \cap E_n|$. Then $\lambda(\mathsf{x}) < \infty$, and the function $\lambda : \mathcal{S} \to [0, \infty)$ is sub-additive.

Note that if $T(\mathsf{x}) = \emptyset$, then $\lambda(\mathsf{x}) = 0$, i.e. we take the usual convention when considering the least upper bounds of subsets of $[0, \infty)$.

Proof. If $T(\mathsf{x})$ is finite there is nothing to prove; so assume $T(\mathsf{x})$ is infinite. Since $\mathcal{C}$ is a colouring of the spread $\mathcal{E}$, we have $\min_{C\in\mathcal{C}} |C \cap E_n| \to \infty$. Therefore, since $T(\mathsf{x})$ is infinite, $|\mathsf{x}^c \cap C \cap E_n| \to \infty$ along $n \in T(\mathsf{x})$. Now it follows from the condition (6) and the definition of λ that $\lambda(\mathsf{x}) < \infty$. Finally, given x and y in $\mathcal{S}$, observe that $T(\mathsf{x} \cup \mathsf{y}) \subseteq T(\mathsf{x}) \cap T(\mathsf{y})$. Hence

$$\lambda(\mathsf{x} \cup \mathsf{y}) \leq \sup_{n\in T(\mathsf{x}\cup\mathsf{y})} (|\mathsf{x} \cap C_0 \cap E_n| + |\mathsf{y} \cap C_0 \cap E_n|) \leq \lambda(\mathsf{x}) + \lambda(\mathsf{y}),$$

as required. □

PROPOSITION 6.5. *Let $\mathcal{S}$, $\mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{C}$ and λ be as in the previous lemma with $\mathcal{S} \boxtimes \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{E}) \supseteq \mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{ort}}(\mathcal{E})$. Then $(\mathcal{S}, \lambda)$ does not have 1-propagation.*

Proof. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let C_0 be the decisive colour class used to define λ, and enumerate the elements of $E_n \cap C_0$ as $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_M$. Because $\mathcal{S} \boxtimes \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{E})$ contains $\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{ort}}(\mathcal{E})$, there exist $\mathsf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{x}_M \in \mathcal{S}$ such that

$$\mathsf{x}_j \cap \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{E}) = E_{<n} \,\dot\cup\, \{\gamma_j\} \,\dot\cup\, E_{>n} \qquad (1 \leq j \leq M).$$

In particular $\mathsf{x}_i \cap E_n = \mathsf{x}_i \cap C_0 \cap E_n = \{\gamma_i\}$, while $\mathsf{x}_i \cap E_j = E_j$ for all $j \neq n$. It follows that $\lambda(\mathsf{x}_i) = 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, M$. Let $\mathcal{F}_n = \{\mathsf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{x}_M\} \subseteq W_1$, and let $\mathsf{b}_n = \mathrm{join}(\mathcal{F}_n)$. Since $\mathsf{b}_n \cap E_n = C_0 \cap E_n$, and since $\mathsf{b}_n \cap E_m = E_m$ for all $m \neq n$, we have $\lambda(\mathsf{b}_n) = 0$. Hence $\mathsf{b}_n \in \mathrm{Filt}(\mathcal{F}_n) \cap W_1$.

Let $K \geq 1$ and suppose $\mathsf{b}_n \in \mathrm{FBP}^\infty_K(\mathcal{F}_n)$. Then, in particular, there exists $m \geq 1$ with the following property:

there exists $\mathsf{y} \in \mathrm{FBP}^m_K(\mathcal{F}_n)$ such that $|\mathsf{y} \cap C_0 \cap E_n| \geq \frac{1}{2}|C_0 \cap E_n|$.

Let m be minimal with respect to this property, and let y be the corresponding member of $\mathrm{FBP}^m_K(\mathcal{F}_n)$. Then there exist $\mathsf{y}_1, \mathsf{y}_2 \in \mathrm{FBP}^{m-1}_K(\mathcal{F}_n)$ such that $\mathsf{y} \subseteq \mathsf{y}_1 \cup \mathsf{y}_2$; again, when $m = 1$, our convention here is that $\mathrm{FBP}^0_K(\mathcal{F}_n) = \mathcal{F}_n$. By the minimality of m, we also have

$$|\mathsf{y}_1 \cap C_0 \cap E_n| < \frac{1}{2}|C_0 \cap E_n| \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathsf{y}_2 \cap C_0 \cap E_n| < \frac{1}{2}|C_0 \cap E_n| \,.$$

By Remark 6.1, $\mathrm{Filt}(\mathcal{F}_n) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathrm{join}(\mathcal{F}_n)) = \mathcal{P}(\mathsf{b}_n)$. In particular y_1 and y_2 are subsets of b_n, and so $\mathsf{y}_i \cap E_n \subseteq \mathsf{b}_n \cap E_n = C_0 \cap E_n$. This implies that $n \in T(\mathsf{y}_1)$, so that

- $\lambda(\mathsf{y}_1) = \sup_{j \in T(\mathsf{y}_1)} |\mathsf{y}_1 \cap C_0 \cap E_j| \geq |\mathsf{y}_1 \cap C_0 \cap E_n|$,
- and similarly, $\lambda(\mathsf{y}_2) \geq |\mathsf{y}_2 \cap C_0 \cap E_n|$.

Putting this all together, and remembering that y_1 and y_2 belong to W_K,

$$\frac{1}{2}|C_0 \cap E_n| \leq |(\mathsf{y}_1 \cup \mathsf{y}_2) \cap C_0 \cap E_n| \leq |\mathsf{y}_1 \cap C_0 \cap E_n| + |\mathsf{y}_2 \cap C_0 \cap E_n| \leq \lambda(\mathsf{y}_1) + \lambda(\mathsf{y}_2) \leq 2K \,.$$

Hence $K \geq \frac{1}{4}|C_0 \cap E_n|$. It follows that $V_{\mathcal{F}_n}(\mathsf{b}_n) \geq \frac{1}{4}|C_0 \cap E_n| \to \infty$, as required. □

7 Applications and examples

7.1 Instability of characters on certain Banach algebras

Corollary 5.7 has applications to the (in)stability of characters on certain kinds of Banach algebras, as considered in [Cho13]. Let us give a quick sketch of how this works.

We recall some terminology and notation (see [Cho13, Joh86]). The space of bounded linear functionals on A is denoted by A^*. A *multiplicative functional* on a Banach algebra A is a (bounded) linear functional $\psi : A \to \mathbb{C}$ satisfying $\psi(ab) = \psi(a)\psi(b)$ for all $a, b \in A$, and the set of all multiplicative functionals on A is denoted by $\mathrm{Mult}(A, \mathbb{C})$. Note that the zero map belongs to $\mathrm{Mult}(A, \mathbb{C})$; the non-zero elements of $\mathrm{Mult}(A, \mathbb{C})$ are the *characters* of A.

Definition 7.1 (Multiplicative defect). Let A be a Banach algebra and let $\psi \in A^*$. The *multiplicative defect of* ψ is the number

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{def}(\psi) &= \|\psi \circ \pi_A - \psi \otimes \psi\|_{(A \widehat{\otimes} A)^*} \\ &= \sup\{\|\psi(xy) - \psi(x)\psi(y)\| : \, x, y \in A, \|x\| \leq 1, \|y\| \leq 1\}, \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where $A \mathbin{\widehat{\otimes}} A$ is the projective tensor product of A with itself, and $\pi_A : A \mathbin{\widehat{\otimes}} A \to A$ is the multiplication map.

Definition 7.2 (AMNM algebras, [Joh86]). A Banach algebra A is said to be *AMNM*, or have the *AMNM property*, or have *stable characters*, if for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $\phi \in A^*$ and $\mathrm{def}(\phi) < \delta$ then $\inf\{\|\phi - \psi\| : \, \phi \in \mathrm{Mult}(A, \mathbb{C})\} < \varepsilon$.

Recall that a weight function on a semilattice S satisfies $\omega(xy) \leq \omega(x)\omega(y)$ for all $x, y \in S$. This submultiplicativity condition is exactly what is needed for the space $\ell^1(S, \omega)$ to form a Banach algebra in a natural way.

LEMMA 7.3. *To verify the AMNM property for $\ell^1(S,\omega)$, it suffices to check the stability condition for only those functionals $\phi \in A^*$ which are $\{0,1\}$-valued.*

Proof. This is essentially [Cho13, Corollary 3.7]. We take the opportunity to clarify a point of possible confusion in the earlier paper. It follows from the proof of [Cho13, Lemma 3.6] that any $\psi \in \mathbb{C}^S$ satisfies $|\psi(x)| \leq (1 + \mathrm{def}_\omega(\psi)^{1/2})\omega(x)$ for all $x \in S$. Hence in the reasoning which follows that lemma, one does not need the *a priori* assumption that $\psi : S \to \mathbb{C}$ is "ω-bounded" — it comes for free. This observation is needed to fully justify [Cho13, Corollary 3.7] in its stated generality. □

This is precisely the situation that our earlier definitions of FBP_C-stable subsets and stability of filters were set up to capture.

THEOREM 7.4. *Let S be a semilattice, and let ω be a weight on S with the associated log-weight λ. Then the following are equivalent*

(i) *The algebra $\ell^1(S,\omega)$ is AMNM.*

(ii) *S has ω-stable filters.*

(iii) *(S,λ) has L-propagation for every $L \geq 0$.*

Proof. The equivalence of (ii) and (iii) is proved in Theorem 5.5.

To show (i)⇒(ii), assuming that S does not have ω-stable filters. Examining the definitions of $\mathrm{def}_\omega(G)$ and $\mathrm{dist}_\omega(G)$, for $G \subseteq S$, one sees they correspond to the local and global quantities in Definition 7.2, for $A = \ell^1(S,\omega)$. So a sequence (G_n) of subsets, which witnesses the failure of ω-stability for filters, gives a sequence (1_{G_n}) in $\ell^1(S,\omega)^*$ that witnesses the failure of the AMNM property. So (i) fails if (ii) fails.

Finally, (ii)⇒(i) follows similarly, using Lemma 7.3. □

It was already known that if S has *finite* breadth, then $\ell^1(S,\omega)$ is AMNM for *every* weight on ω; this follows from [Cho13, Example 3.13 and Theorem 3.14]. Using Corollary 5.7 we can now establish the converse, which yields new examples of commutative (semisimple) Banach algebras that are not AMNM.

THEOREM 7.5. *Let S be a semilattice with infinite breadth. Then there exists a submultiplicative weight $\omega : S \to [1,\infty)$ such that $\ell^1(S,\omega)$ is not AMNM.*

Proof. This follows from Corollary 5.7 and Theorem 7.4. □

7.2 Some further examples

The proof of Theorem 5.6 could have been streamlined if either of the following claims were true:

(i) if $q : S \to T$ is a surjective homomorphism of semilattices, and (T,λ^*) fails L-propagation, then $(S,\lambda^* \circ q)$ fails L-propagation;

(ii) if (S,λ) has L-propagation then so does (R,λ) for every subsemilattice $R \subset S$.



Figure 2: Sets x_j and a_n

We present examples here to show that both claims are false.

Let $\Omega = \{0,1,2\} \times \mathbb{N}$. Consider two sequences $(\mathsf{x}_j)_{j=1}^{\infty}$ and $(\mathsf{a}_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ defined as follows:

$$\mathsf{x}_j := \{(1,j),(2,j)\} \quad ; \quad \mathsf{a}_n := \left\{(0,k),(1,k) \colon n^2 \le k < (n+1)^2\right\}.$$

For ease of reference, let $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathsf{a}_n \colon n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\mathcal{X} = \{\mathsf{x}_j \colon j \in \mathbb{N}\}$. We define $\mathcal{S}$ to be the semilattice generated inside $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ by $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{X}$. It is straightforward to show that every member of $\mathcal{S}$ has a unique decomposition, up to ordering, as a union of members of $\mathcal{A}$ and members of $\mathcal{X}$. We will think of the members of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{X}$ as "prime factors".

Now let $\Omega^* = \{1,2\} \times \mathbb{N} \subset \Omega$, and consider the *truncation homomorphism*

$$q : \mathcal{P}(\Omega) \to \mathcal{P}(\Omega^*) \quad , \quad \mathsf{z} \mapsto \mathsf{z} \cap \Omega^*.$$

Any log-weight λ^* defined on $\mathcal{P}(\Omega^*)$ pulls back to give a log-weight $\lambda = \lambda^* \circ q$ on $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$. We now take

$$\lambda^*(\mathsf{z}) := |\{j \in \mathbb{N} \colon (2,j) \in \mathsf{z}\}|$$

which is clearly subadditive, and so gives us a log-weight on $\mathcal{P}(\Omega^*)$. Note that λ is given by the same formula as λ^*. Moreover, if $\mathsf{z} \in \mathcal{S}$, then $\lambda(\mathsf{z})$ counts how many factors from $\mathcal{X}$ occur in the "prime factorization" of z.

EXAMPLE 7.6. Define $\mathcal{T} = q(\mathcal{S}) \subset \mathcal{P}(\Omega^*)$. We will show that $(\mathcal{T}, \lambda^*)$ does not have 1-propagation.

Let $\mathsf{b}_n := q(\mathsf{a}_n) = \left\{(1,k) \colon n^2 \le k < (n+1)^2\right\}$ and let $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathsf{b}_n \colon n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Then $\mathcal{T}$ is the subsemilattice of $\mathcal{P}(\Omega^*)$ generated by $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{B}$. For each n, let $\mathcal{E}_n = \{\mathsf{x}_k \colon n^2 \le k < (n+1)^2\}$. Then $\mathcal{E}_n \subseteq W_1(\mathcal{T})$ and $\mathsf{b}_n \in \mathrm{Filt}(\mathcal{E}_n) \cap W_1(\mathcal{T})$. Therefore, it suffices to prove that $V_{\mathcal{E}_n}(\mathsf{b}_n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. In fact, we will show that $V_{\mathcal{E}_n}(\mathsf{b}_n) \ge n$, by proving the following result.

Claim. Let $1 \le C \le n$. Then $\mathrm{FBP}_C^m(\mathcal{E}_n) \subseteq \langle \mathcal{E}_n \rangle = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E}_n)$.

This claim implies the desired inequality, since $\mathsf{b}_n \notin \langle \mathcal{E}_n \rangle$. We prove the claim by induction on m, using the familiar barrier argument. The case $m = 0$ is trivial. If the claim holds for $m = k-1$ where $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then let y and $\mathsf{z} \in \mathrm{FBP}_C^{k-1}(\mathcal{E}_n)$ and let $\mathsf{a} \in W_C(\mathcal{T})$ satisfy $\mathsf{a} \subseteq \mathsf{y} \cup \mathsf{z}$. By the inductive hypothesis, y and z are subsets of $\mathcal{E}_n$. Since $\lambda^*(\mathsf{y}) \le C \le n$ and $\lambda^*(\mathsf{z}) \le C \le n$, while $|\mathcal{E}_n| = (n+1)^2 - n^2 = 2n+1$, $\mathsf{y} \cup \mathsf{z}$ must be a proper subset of $\mathcal{E}_n$. Hence, no member of $\mathcal{B}$ is contained in $\mathsf{y} \cup \mathsf{z}$, and clearly the only members of $\mathcal{X}$ contained in $\mathsf{y} \cup \mathsf{z}$ are the members of $\mathcal{E}_n$, so $\mathsf{a} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E}_n)$. Thus, the claim holds for $m = k$, completing the inductive step. $\square$

EXAMPLE 7.7. $(\mathcal{S}, \lambda)$ has L-propagation for all $L \geq 0$.

Proof. Fix $L \geq 0$ and let $\mathcal{E}$ be a non-empty subset of W_L. Given $\mathsf{z} \in \mathrm{Filt}(\mathcal{E}) \cap W_L$, we will show that $V_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathsf{z}) \leq L$. First note that each "prime factor" of z must be a factor of some element in $\mathcal{E}$ (by unique factorization). Hence, $\mathsf{z} = \mathsf{a}' \cup \mathsf{x}'$ where a' is a product of things in $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathrm{fac}(\mathcal{E})$ and x' is a product of things in $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathrm{fac}(\mathcal{E})$.

We may write $\mathsf{x}' = \mathsf{x}_{n(1)} \cup \mathsf{x}_{n(2)} \cup \cdots \cup \mathsf{x}_{n(k)}$ where $n(1) < n(2) < \cdots < n(k)$. Then $k = \lambda(\mathsf{z}) \leq L$. If $L < 1$ then $\mathsf{z} = \mathsf{a}'$; by induction on the number m of the "prime factors" of a', we obtain $\mathsf{a}' \in \mathrm{FBP}_0^m(\mathcal{E}) \subseteq \mathrm{FBP}_L^\infty(\mathcal{E})$, and so we're done. If $L \geq 1$, then by inductively considering $\mathsf{y}_0 := \mathsf{a}'$, $\mathsf{y}_1 := \mathsf{y}_0 \cup \mathsf{x}_{n(1)}$, $\mathsf{y}_2 := \mathsf{y}_1 \cup \mathsf{x}_{n(2)}$, etc., we obtain $\mathsf{y}_j \in \mathrm{FBP}_L^{j+m}(\mathcal{E})$ for all $j = 0, 1, \ldots, k$. Since $\mathsf{z} = \mathsf{y}_k \in \mathrm{FBP}_L^\infty(\mathcal{E})$, this completes the proof. □

Now consider the sets $\mathsf{g}_j := \{(1, j) \colon j \in \mathbb{N}\}$. We let $\mathcal{G}$ be the set of all g_j and define $\mathcal{R}$ to be the semilattice generated by $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{G}$. Since each b_n is the union of finitely many members of $\mathcal{G}$, we see that $\mathcal{T}$ is a subsemilattice of $\mathcal{R}$.

EXAMPLE 7.8. We claim that $(\mathcal{R}, \lambda^*)$ has L-propagation for all $L \geq 0$. The proof is very similar to the proof for $(\mathcal{S}, \lambda)$. Unlike $\mathcal{S}$, the semilattice $\mathcal{R}$ does not have "unique factorization"; but each $\mathsf{z} \in \mathcal{R}$ has a largest factor belonging to $\langle \mathcal{X} \rangle$, and this factor has a unique decomposition as a union of members of $\mathcal{X}$. Using this, one can carry out the same kind of argument that was used to show $(\mathcal{S}, \lambda)$ has L-propagation. We leave the details to the reader.

Acknowledgements

This work grew out of conversations between the authors while attending the conference "Banach Algebras and Applications", held in Gothenburg, Sweden, July–August 2013, and was further developed while the authors were attending the thematic program "Abstract Harmonic Analysis, Banach and Operator Algebras" at the Fields Institute, Canada, during March–April 2014. The authors thank the organizers of these meetings for invitations to attend and for pleasant environments to discuss research. The first author acknowledges the financial support of the Faculty of Science and Technology at Lancaster University, in the form of a travel grant to attend the latter meeting. The third author acknowledges the financial supports of a Fast Start Marsden Grant and of Victoria University of Wellington to attend these meetings.

Further work was done during the second author's visit to Lancaster University in November 2014, which was supported by a Scheme 2 grant from the London Mathematical Society. She thanks the Department of Mathematics and Statistics at Lancaster for their hospitality.

References

[ADH+13] M. Aschenbrenner, A. Dolich, D. Haskell, D. Macpherson, and S. Starchenko, *Vapnik-Chervonenkis density in some theories without the independence property, II*, Notre Dame J. Form. Log., 54 (2013), pp. 311–363.

[ADH+16] M. Aschenbrenner, A. Dolich, D. Haskell, D. Macpherson, and S. Starchenko, *Vapnik-Chervonenkis density in some theories without the independence property, I*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 368 (2016), pp. 5889–5949.

[Bir67] G. Birkhoff, *Lattice theory*, Third edition. American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, Vol. XXV, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1967.

[Cho13] Y. Choi, *Approximately multiplicative maps from weighted semilattice algebras*, J. Aust. Math. Soc., 95 (2013), pp. 36–67.

[Dit84] S. Z. Ditor, *Cardinality questions concerning semilattices of finite breadth*, Discrete Math., 48 (1984), pp. 47–59.

[Gie94] G. Gierz, *Level sets in finite distributive lattices of breadth* 3, Discrete Math., 132 (1994), pp. 51–63.

[GH09] S. Givant and P. Halmos, *Introduction to Boolean algebras*, Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer, New York, 2009.

[Joh86] B. E. Johnson, *Approximately multiplicative functionals*, J. London Math. Soc. (2), 34 (1986), pp. 489–510.

[Law71] J. D. Lawson, *The relation of breadth and codimension in topological semilattices. II*, Duke Math. J., 38 (1971), pp. 555–559.

[LLM77] J. D. Lawson, J. R. Liukkonen, and M. W. Mislove, *Measure algebras of semilattices with finite breadth*, Pacific J. Math., 69 (1977), pp. 125–139.

[Mis86] M. Mislove, *Detecting local finite breadth in continuous lattices and semilattices*, in Mathematical foundations of programming semantics (Manhattan, Kan., 1985), vol. 239 of Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., Springer, Berlin, 1986, pp. 205–214.

Yemon Choi, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YF, United Kingdom.

y.choi1@lancaster.ac.uk

Mahya Ghandehari, Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware 19716, United States of America.

mahya@udel.edu

Hung Le Pham, School of Mathematics and Statistics, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington 6140, New Zealand.

hung.pham@vuw.ac.nz